

? UNSETTLED ?
QUESTIONS
OTTIS
?

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap.----- Copyright No.-----

Shelf-----
BIT 1101
085

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

UNSETTLED QUESTIONS.

By the Same Author

THE FIFTH GOSPEL

The Land Where Jesus Lived

BY

J. M. P. OTTS, D.D., LL.D.

FULLY ILLUSTRATED

12MO

Cloth

\$1.25

This book, as the title indicates, is a careful study of the four written Gospels in the lights and shades of the land where Jesus lived and taught. When they are thus studied it is found that the land so harmonizes with them, and so unfolds and elucidates their meaning, that it forms around them, as it were, a fifth Gospel.

"It presents a vivid picture of Bible scenery and a safe and sound thinker's illumination of many Scripture texts by the light of travel."—*Christian Thought*.

"A book of great ability and vivacity that will arouse much interest and elicit much thoughtful discussion."—*Christian Observer*.

"A charming and instructive volume that exhibits keen observation and critical power."—*Presbyterian Journal*.

"Whatever other books one may have read on Palestine, he will find new pleasure and instruction from the perusal of this."—*Central Presbyterian*.

"This book is really inspiring."—*The Baptist*.

Sent postpaid on receipt of price

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

NEW YORK, 112 Fifth Avenue
CHICAGO, 148 & 150 Madison Street

THE DAVIDSON COLLEGE DIVINITY LECTURES
FOR THE YEAR MDCCCXCIII



UNSETTLED QUESTIONS

TOUCHING
THE FOUNDATIONS OF
CHRISTIANITY


...

A Book for Thoughtful Young Men

J. M. P. Otts BY
J. M. P. OTTS, D. D., LL. D.
AUTHOR OF "THE FIFTH GOSPEL," ETC.

If the foundations be destroyed,
what can the righteous do?

PSALM xi: 3



2002441

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY
NEW YORK CHICAGO
112 Fifth Avenue 148 & 150 Madison St.
Publishers of Evangelical Literature

(1898)

BT 1101
085

COPYRIGHT,
1893,
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
—
WASHINGTON

6c
H 26 my 39
W E H 26 H 39 M

DEDICATION.

TO LELIA J. OTTS, my beloved wife, and our eight sons, who are growing up in the faith which she taught them when as little ones they knelt at her knee to pray, and to Davidson College, my beloved Alma Mater, and her numerous sons who are filling various positions of usefulness in Church and State for which their Christian education has qualified them, and to all thoughtful young men into whose hands it may fall, I most affectionately dedicate this book, which has been written for young men, hoping that, in this age when the faith learned at mother's knee is unsettled in so many minds, it may help remove honest doubts from earnest souls, and confirm in them an intelligent and reasonable faith in the glorious religion of Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, who is at once our Lord and Saviour and our great and all-loving Brotherman.

J. M. P. OTTS.

MAGNOLIA HALL, Greensboro', Ala.

“The superstition which saw in all natural phenomena the action of capricious deities was not more irrational than the superstition which sees in them nothing but the action of invariable law.”—THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

PREFACE.

THE substance of this little book was prepared for undergraduates, and was delivered as lectures on the Evidences of Christianity to a company of college students; but the book, as now published, is intended for the benefit of the people at large, especially for the use of thoughtful young men. This fact is indicated on the title-page, because we wish to emphasize it as the reason why this unpretentious volume is given to the public. As it was originally designed for beginners in college studies, it is hoped that it may be instructive and helpful to the great mass of general readers who have not time to peruse and study the voluminous and ponderous works of the great writers on the living questions that touch the very foundations of Christianity. All men who think and read at all must be profoundly interested in such questions, but only a few, comparatively, have leisure and opportunity to give to the original works of the great writers that careful and protracted study that is required to enable them to comprehend their technicalities

and to appreciate their arguments for or against the Christian religion.

The position that this little volume aspires to fill is that of a daysman or interpreter between the great philosophers and scientists and the common people. In a word, the work aims to be at once philosophical and popular, scientific and yet simple. In order to fill this position we have endeavored, as far as possible, to avoid the use of technical terms and phrases, and to express our thoughts in the plain and practical language of every-day life. And also, in order that our work might be thoroughly adapted to the purpose for which it is published, we have given, as a prolegomenary preface to the body of the book, the philosophical basis of thought on which the process of reasoning in our argument is grounded. We wish to place in the hands of the general reader a little volume that is complete in itself, containing all explanations and definitions necessary for the full comprehension of all points and principles involved in the discussion.

The title, "Unsettled Questions Touching the Foundations of Christianity," is not meant to imply that the foundations of Christianity are themselves in an unsettled condition, but that human inquiry concerning them is ceaseless and unending. The great questions which we discuss are now, as

they have always been, open questions. When they receive unquestionable answers, they will cease to be questions at all. Questions once in debate must be held as unsettled until the debate is closed by a unanimous decision in the affirmative or negative. For the great questions that touch the foundations of Christianity the day of unanimous decision has not yet arrived, nor is it likely soon to arrive. They have always been in debate, and it is not probable that they will cease to be debatable and debated for a long time to come. A large portion of Christian literature, including writings that date back to the earliest Christian centuries as well as the very latest productions of Christian thought, is of an apologetic nature. Christians have made ample provisions, in perpetual professorships established in all leading educational institutions throughout Christendom, for the discussion of Christian evidences in all the ages to come. This shows that Christians themselves recognize the fact that great questions involved in the very foundations of Christianity are yet unsettled, and are likely to remain in an unsettled state for many centuries yet to come. This state of affairs should not seem strange to us, for there are three great reasons that readily account for it.

In the first place, the fundamental questions of

religion are not of a nature to admit of demonstration amounting to mathematical certainty. But in this respect religion is not peculiar. The fundamental questions of philosophy, science, and politics are equally incapable of mathematical demonstration. This is evident in the various and conflicting schools of philosophy and science, and in the various and antagonistic forms of government. In all the great issues of life man believes and acts on the light and guidance of his reason, and not, like the beasts, blindly, as moved by the unvarying impulses of instinct. All questions concerning which there is yet room for reasonable discussion must be held as unsettled. Where mathematical certainty comes in, the possibility of progress and improvement in knowledge ceases.

In the second place, the interests at stake are so tremendous and supremely overwhelming that each new generation is constrained to reopen the fundamental questions of religion, and to make fresh investigations for itself. And each individual, when he begins to think for himself, and to guide his life by thought, feels himself compelled to take up the great questions of religion, and to work out for his own life his own personal solutions. Therefore, while these great questions are settled in the minds of multitudes, they are always unsettled questions

in the minds of the majority of the human race at any given time. They are unsettled questions in the sense that they are of perpetual duration, always open for criticism and discussion.

And in the third place, the great questions which we discuss are perpetually unsettled, because Christianity has always had, and always will have, its enemies and opponents. These are divided into two great classes: those who reject Christianity because, if admitted, it would lay a prohibition on selfish passions which they wish to indulge; and those who cannot accept Christianity because it does not fall into accord with their conceptions of the nature and order of the universe. With the first class of unbelievers, unbelief precedes reason, and is not produced by it, but uses reason as a means of self-defense. The vast majority of unbelievers in Christian lands belong to this first class, and what is needed for their conversion is not a better informed intellect, but a better disposed heart. With the second class unbelief follows their reasoning, and is based upon their honest convictions, or rather upon their inability to come to honest convictions of the truth of the fundamental facts of Christianity. They are sincere in their difficulties and doubts, and many of them are earnest and anxious inquirers after the truth. In

their minds the great religious problems are unsettled questions because they have not been able to arrive at convincing conclusions. For this class we have the highest respect and the profoundest sympathy, and to them we most respectfully commend our little book, hoping that its careful perusal may in some degree help remove from their minds doubts and obscurities, and lead them to settled convictions on the most important questions that can engage human thought.

CONTENTS.

DEDICATION.....	v
PREFACE.....	vii
PROLEGOMENA.	
THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF OUR ARGUMENT.....	1
INTRODUCTION.	
THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.....	29
CHAPTER FIRST.	
IS GOD AN ETERNAL PERSON?.....	39
CHAPTER SECOND.	
IS MAN AN IMMORTAL SOUL?.....	71
CHAPTER THIRD.	
IS THE BIBLE A DIVINE REVELATION?.....	103
CHAPTER FOURTH.	
IS CHRIST A LIVING SAVIOUR?.....	137

PROLEGOMENA.
THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF OUR
ARGUMENT.

“No difficulty emerges in theology which had not previously emerged in philosophy.”—SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON.

PROLEGOMENA.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF OUR ARGUMENT.

It is of prime importance that those to whom an argument is addressed should have from the outset a clear understanding of the philosophical basis on which its process of reasoning is founded. It is incumbent upon the author to show the soundness of his system of thought, the indubitableness of the data with which he begins, and the sufficiency of the mode by which he connects all the steps of his argument from his data to his conclusions. It is also important for the author to define in advance, or as he advances, the precise sense in which he uses any words or phrases that have ambiguous meanings. Therefore, as a prolegomenary preface to the lectures that are to follow, I here lay down in brief, and define the philosophical basis of the system of thought which I hold, and on which I ground my reasoning.

1. I hold that self-consciousness is the beginning of all human knowledge. I am conscious of my own existence. With this indisputable fact I begin, and upon it I build up my knowledge of myself and of the world by which I am surrounded.

I am. Whatever I may be, and however I may have come into existence, of this I am certain, I am. This is the one fact that is proved simply by the assertion, because there must be an asserter before there can be an assertion. I say that I am, and that is the end of all controversy; because, if I were not, I could not say that I am. I may be mistaken as to what I am, but I cannot possibly be mistaken as to the fact that I am.

And now further, I feel, therefore I am a sentient being; I think, therefore I am an intelligent being; and I will, therefore I am a free intelligence. A free intelligence is a person—one who thinks and who acts as self-directed by his own free choices. I am thinking as I now write, and I know that I can write down my thoughts, or refrain from writing them, just as I please. I think, and I am free to express my thoughts or to keep them to myself. I am a free person. I *am to-day*; and I know that I *was yesterday*; therefore I remember. Since I remember I am a continuous being. I *am* and I *was*. I who feel, think, and

will to-day am the same one who was feeling, thinking, and willing in all my past existence that is gathered up in my memory. My memory links my past existence with my present consciousness in a way that proves that I not only exist, but that I also persist in a continuous existence. By memory I not only recall a fact of past experience, but I awaken a present consciousness that *I* experienced at a past time the fact that is recalled. Therefore I am not a succession of separate and independent feelings, thoughts, and volitions, but I am a continuous person who has experienced the successive states of consciousness which memory recalls. Thus I become conscious of the unbroken continuity of my self-identity. I am the something—the abiding personality—that persists in a continuous existence in the midst of the succession of my changing feelings, thoughts, and volitions. I am one and indivisible, and always the same one. But what am I? I am more than a thought, or a succession of thoughts; I am a thinker. I am more than an act, or a succession of actions; I am an actor. I think and I act, and I act as self-directed by my will. I am a continuous person. I remember my past thoughts and actions as my own; therefore I am a person of persistent and unbroken self-identity. I may cease to be in the

future, but I have always been the same person since I began to be.

There may be sensibility without personality. A thing, an oyster, for instance, may be sensible of its own existence without being able to distinguish itself from other existences. It is mere sensitive matter. A thing may be conscious of its own separate existence without being able to define its relations to other things. In such beings there is a consciousness of individuality, but not of personality. A mere animal, a dog, for instance, is conscious of its own individual existence and of the impressions that other existences make upon it, but it cannot define its place in the universe nor its relations to the things by which it is surrounded. In this self-conscious animal life there is something higher than a mere sentient existence; there is a simulation of thought, if not thought itself. But it seems, so far as our observation can penetrate, that self-conscious animal life acts solely under the influence of internal impulses and external impressions, and as guided, not by a free will, but by the mysterious power of instinct. In all this there is nothing to contradict the hypothesis that all mere animal life, including its sensations and movements, is purely physical and entirely under the domain of physical causation.

But when we come to man we find not only self-consciousness, but also self-direction in thought and action. Man is not only conscious of a distinct individuality, but of a separate personality. He knows himself to be a person who thinks and reasons his way to his conclusions, and who wills and chooses his course in life. In order to free choice there must be discrimination between thoughts, and in order to this discrimination there must be a cognition of the relations of persons and things. This cognition of the relations subsisting between things is real or rational knowledge. So far as our observation can penetrate, we see nothing to warrant us in supposing that mere animals are capable of perceiving things in the complications of their relations to one another. They are not capable of rational knowledge. They have sensations and impressions, but this does not amount to rational knowledge. They cannot define and classify their sensations and impressions. They are not persons, but sensitive things that feel and act as impelled by their sensations. Their movements are effects produced by causes which have their origin in inward physical impulses, or in outward physical impressions. But yet the animal is something more than a bundle of sensations. There is a persistent something that feels

and moves as impelled. That something may be nothing more than sensitive matter—who knows? There is nothing within the purview of our observation to compel us to infer the existence in mere animal life of anything more than sensitive matter, susceptible of internal and external impressions, and of movements prompted by such sensible impressions.

We have already found that man is something more than a composite bundle of sensations, thoughts, and volitions. He is a persistent something that not only feels and moves as impelled by his sensations, but which also thinks and acts freely under the self-direction of his thoughts. Is that something, which is a self-conscious, a self-acting, and a self-directing free intelligence, mere matter? Can any conceivable form of mere matter account for the rational thoughts and free activities of human life?

What is matter? We know matter only in its phenomenal attributes. We see the phenomena and infer the entity of which they are the manifestations. The phenomenal qualities of matter are either primary or secondary. The primary attributes are those that belong to all matter, and without which matter cannot exist. The secondary are those qualities which are not essential to

the existence of matter, and which may therefore exist in one mass of matter and not in another. A stone has extension and form, and is hard. Extension and form are primary and essential attributes of matter, but hardness is a particular quality of the stone. We cannot think of matter without conceiving of it as having some shape and as filling some space, but we may conceive of matter as being hard or soft, liquid or solid, visible or invisible, tangible or intangible. All matter must be extended, and must have some shape, some consistency, some size, and some weight. Now, incompatible attributes cannot inhere in the same entity at the same time. The same thing cannot be at the same time square and round, hard and soft, bitter and sweet.

Now let us apply these essential conditions of material existence to thought and volition and see if we can account for them as attributes of matter. Can we conceive of a thought or a volition as having physical dimensions or physical consistency—as being round or oblong, hard or soft, liquid or solid, white or some other color? If it is a phenomenon of a physical entity, it must fulfill an alternative of these several conditions of physical existence. We cannot conceive of a thought as having weight, size, shape, color, or a physical consistency.

And besides, can we conceive of a volition—a free choice—as enchained in the concatenation of physical causation? Are my volitions—am I myself—nothing but the inevitable outcome of the necessary determinism of physical causation? If there be nothing but matter in the universe, there can be no free will—no personality. But I will—I know that I am free in my volitions; therefore there is something in this universe that is not enchained in the iron links of physical causation—there is something that is not matter. We call that other entity mind. I am as a free intelligence not matter, but mind. Mind cannot be the product of matter. Matter may be the product of mind, that is, of creative mind. At present we are only concerned about the human mind—our mind. We find that it is not matter. I am not a phenomenon. I am a persistent entity that thinks and wills; and I remember my thoughts and my volitions. I have found myself, and I find that I am not matter, but mind. I am a person—a free intelligence that thinks, wills, and remembers, and acts as self-directed.

As a free intelligence I perceive the relations of things, and I compare and correlate their relations and draw inferences. Thus I accumulate a store of rational knowledge, inferring the unknown from

the known. I am a reasoner, and the conclusions of reasoning, if grounded on a sound basis, and if its processes be logically conducted, are just as trustworthy as the data of consciousness and the facts of observation. Every argument must be founded on a sound philosophical basis of thought in order to conduct the reasoner to true conclusions. Science is concerned about the phenomena of things. Things may be either physical or psychical. The science of physical phenomena is physics. The science of psychical phenomena is metaphysics. Philosophy is concerned about the laws of thought. It is the foundation that underlies both physics and metaphysics. If the philosophical bases of an argument are not sound the conclusions are not trustworthy.

2. In my self-consciousness I find that I am capable of reflecting upon myself. I analyze my self-consciousness, and I find these three things necessarily involved in it: a subject, a verb, and an object. I—know—myself.

If I know, I must know something, and know that I know it. It is in this way that I come to know myself as a being that knows. When I think, I know that my thought is not myself, but something which I do. I distinguish between myself and my thoughts. I know myself to be a subject that knows.

Thus I find that in my consciousness I distinguished between myself and the faculties of thought, feeling, will, and memory of which I find myself possessed, and also between my faculties and their activities; and yet I find that my different faculties are but different modes in which I myself, always one and always the same one, act. It is not a part of me that thinks, another part that feels, another part that wills, and another part that remembers; but it is myself, always one and always the same one, that thinks, feels, wills, and remembers. Whatever other faculties or capacities I find myself in possession of, I find that they are only the various modes in which I am capable of acting, or of being acted upon. Thus I am conscious of being an indivisible one, and always the same one.

From this analysis I have the following indisputable data of consciousness, the indivisible unity and unbreakable continuity of my self-identity as a being who thinks, feels, wills, and remembers.

3. I now drop the prefix "self" and consider consciousness as a mode in which I, the self-conscious being, act or am acted upon. We distinguish between consciousness and self-consciousness just as Sir William Hamilton distinguishes between perception-proper and sensation-proper. The two things are inseparable, but distinguishable. Self-

consciousness is the man himself aware of his own existence, and consciousness is a modification in self-consciousness by which the man becomes aware of his faculties and their activities as distinguishable from himself and from one another. Consciousness is that state of self-consciousness by which we become aware of what transpires within ourselves as thoughts, feelings, volitions, recollections, and the like. Man becomes conscious that his faculties and their activities are distinct, though inseparable, from himself. They are modes of self-movements.

4. I am conscious not only of my self-existence and subjective activities and passivities, but also that I exist in the midst of an external world by which my life is environed and conditioned. It is not needful, in order to a clear apprehension of our system of thought, for us to enter into the discussions of the philosophers as to how we become conscious of the external world. It is sufficient for us to say, in our view, perception is that modification in consciousness by which we are made cognizant of the external world and of the phenomena of the things in it. This is effected by impressions made upon the internal consciousness by the sensations of touch, vision, hearing, taste, and smell, when these senses come into proper relations with their

appropriate objects, or rather with the appropriate properties of external objects.

5. Beyond all this, I am conscious of another power within myself—the power of reason, by which I compare and correlate the data of internal consciousness and the facts of external perception, and construe them into the expressions of formulated thoughts. Thus I arrive at a cognition of the relations of things. This cognition of the relations of things is knowledge in the proper sense of the word.

6. In our system of thought the three great words are consciousness, perception, and reason. Consciousness is that modification of self-consciousness by which we become aware of what takes place within us; perception is that modification of consciousness by which we are made cognizant, through the external senses, of what exists outside and around us; and reason is that power of mind by which we compare and correlate the data of consciousness, including the facts of perception as reported to consciousness, and thus define the relations subsisting between them, and discover the further truths that are involved in those relations and their implications. The greatest of these is consciousness, because it is the source—*fons et origo*—from which the stream of human knowledge flows.

7. I find that by reasoning I advance from the known to the unknown by one or the other of two methods of thought: by the immediate inference, or by the syllogistic conclusion. When one thought or fact necessarily infolds and implies a second thought or fact, then that second thought or fact must be received as the necessary inference from the first. Descartes' celebrated *Cogito, ergo sum* is not a syllogism, but is an immediate inference. The fact that I think necessarily infolds and implies the fact of my existence. The presence of thought implies the existence of a thinker. If the first fact is admitted on the testimony of consciousness, the second fact must be also received as an immediate inference from the first.

When two thoughts or facts are found to be in such a relationship to each other that the relation between them infolds and implies a third thought or fact, then that third thought or fact must be received as the syllogistic conclusion of the two preceding thoughts or facts. The conclusion may be affirmative or negative, that is, the relation between the major and the minor premises may necessarily include the third thought or fact, or may necessarily exclude it. Every vegetable substance is combustible. The tree is a vegetable substance. Therefore every tree is combustible. The

second fact, that the tree is a vegetable substance, is so related to the first fact, that all vegetable substances are combustible, that the third fact, the combustibility of the tree, is included in that relationship. No vegetable substance has the power of locomotion. Man has the power of locomotion. Therefore man is not a vegetable substance. The second fact, that man has the power of locomotion, is so related to the first fact, that no vegetable substance has the power of locomotion, that it follows, as a third fact, that man is excluded from the class of vegetable substances. The syllogistic conclusion is the inevitable result that flows from the known relationship between two thoughts or facts, when the two thoughts or facts are found to be so related that their relation includes, or excludes, the third thought or fact in question.

8. In this way, by the immediate inference and the syllogistic conclusion, I find that my knowledge is continuously expanded and enlarged. Thus I advance, accumulating knowledge, from the known to the unknown. When the unknown becomes known I make it the foundation for further advancement.

In this progress of knowledge I start out with the fundamental axioms of thought as the ultimate foundation of all reasoning; and on this founda-

tion I erect the temple of my knowledge by building into it all the facts of my experience, and the immediate inferences and syllogistic conclusions that those facts infold and imply.

But the question here arises, How do I come into possession of the axioms of thought which are the starting-points in every process of reasoning? Is man's knowledge of them acquired by experience, or does he find them in his mind as innate ideas? His knowledge of them, when viewed from different standpoints, has the appearance of being both innate and acquired. But if they are innate, they are not acquired; and if acquired, they were not innate.

We are obliged to agree with Locke that there are no innate ideas—ideas inborn in the mind as its birth-furniture. It is questionable, however, whether there ever was a philosopher of any repute who held the doctrine of innate ideas in the sense in which Locke presents and refutes it. But, on the other hand, it seems to me that Locke and his disciples have gone to an untenable extreme in the doctrine that the mind of the new-born child is like a sheet of blank paper, upon which experience alone can write its record. It seems to me, rather, that the mind at birth is like a flowering plant just shooting through the ground. At birth the mind

is as destitute of ideas as the shooting plant is of flowers; but it is the nature of the plant to develop flowers as it naturally unfolds itself, and it is the nature of the mind to form primitive convictions of the fundamental laws of thought in the processes of its natural development. They are not innate, but are as naturally unfolded in the development of the mind as flowers are in the development of the plant. They spring, not from experience, but from the mind itself, just as the flowers spring from the plant. They are not born *in* the mind nor *with* the mind, but are born *of* the mind. As soon as presented they are recognized as true and indisputable. They cannot be proved by any process of reasoning, nor can they be doubted while reason holds her seat upon the throne of the mind. Our knowledge of the laws of thought, that is, the conditions of thought in general, springs up in our minds, when the occasion calls them forth, as primitive convictions—as *a priori* cognitions; while our knowledge of the facts of experience is acquired—is *a posteriori* knowledge. Our *a posteriori* knowledge is our cognitions of facts and of their relations to one another, while our *a priori* knowledge is not a cognition of the facts of experience, but of the laws of thought, “under which,” as says Sir William Hamilton, “our knowledge *a*

posteriori—our knowledge of facts—is possible.” Our cognitions of the necessary laws of thought, the self-evident axioms of thought, are not innate, but are primitive convictions of the mind that do not come into existence until the external occasion for their use calls them forth. As soon as suggested they are seen by all sane minds to be true, necessary, and universal. They are not innate, but are born of the mind itself, not as the product of experience, but as primitive convictions, arising in the mind itself when occasion calls for them. Hence, as Sir William Hamilton says: “This all-important doctrine has never been so well stated as in an unknown sentence of an old and now forgotten thinker: ‘*Cognitio omniſ a mente primam origem, a ſenſibus exordium habet primum.*’” Hence, our knowledge of the necessary laws of thought, which, from one point of view, seems to be innate, and from another point of view seems to be acquired, is neither, but is self-originated from the mind itself; but the axioms of thought are never originated until an external occasion calls for them; then they are immediately and universally recognized as primitive convictions of the mind, in themselves necessary and indisputable.

9. Our purpose in this prolegomenary essay does not require us to give a list of the axioms of

thought, but only to designate and define those which we shall use in the lectures which are to follow. The following are the most important.

The data of consciousness are to be received simply on the testimony of consciousness as unquestionably trustworthy. This is the foundation on which all knowledge ultimately rests.

The facts of observation, both the facts of internal consciousness and of external perception, are to be received as realities—not as essential realities, but as phenomenal realities. We do not perceive existence in itself as absolute entity, but only in its phenomena; but the facts of observation, while they are facts of phenomena and not of entities, are realities and not illusions. The difference between the data of consciousness and the facts of observation is this: the data of consciousness are the fundamental principles of existences, and the facts of observation are the phenomena of things as they exist in their relations to consciousness.

The third great axiom of thought is the law of causation. The human mind is so constituted that it demands a cause for everything that exists, unless it be an eternal existence. Our thought cannot realize to itself the possibility of a phenomenon without a cause. By observation we simply know

that the thing is; but this does not satisfy the mind. We want to know why or how the thing is. Scientific knowledge is the knowledge of things by their causes. The law of causation is the philosophical basis of all scientific inquiry. It is the only road that leads to scientific conclusions.

10. When I begin to think, I find that it is impossible for me to advance in a progression of thought without postulating the law of causation as the mode of thought. When I see an object and wish to understand it, I begin at once to search for the cause or causes that produced it. When I find the producing cause, then I feel that I understand the object. I have reached a scientific knowledge of it. In this process of thought I postulate the law of causation as the invariable method of existence. When we lay down the law of causation as a fundamental axiom of thought, we do not simply mean that it is the subjective order of the succession of thoughts within our minds, but that the mind conceives of it as the method of existence. Everything that exists, except the eternal thing, must have a cause. We advance from the known to the discovery of the unknown *because we know*—*by the cause of our knowing*—that if such an effect exists it must have such a cause, or if such a cause exists it must produce such an effect. Every pro-

cess of reasoning is a forward movement along the line of causation from the known cause to its necessary effect, or a backward movement from the known effect to its necessary cause. Science is the knowledge of effects in their causes, and of causes in their effects, and the systematic combination, in logical order, of the knowledge of things by their causes. Thus science is based upon the conception of the necessary sequence of cause and effect, as the invariable method of existence. This conception is found in every sound mind. One in whose mind it does not develop at the dawn of thought is a born idiot. One who loses it after it has once been developed in his mind has become insane. Without receiving the law of causation as the method of existence, one can never conceive of the existence of anything beyond the observed facts of the narrow circle of his individual experience. This law of causation, received as the invariable method of existence, is the fountain from which the whole stream of logical ratiocination flows. It is man's power to grasp this law, and by it to discover the unknown from the known, that elevates him above the beasts, which have no light to guide them except the dull perception of their senses and the mysterious guidance of instinct.

When we analyze the law of causation as the

invariable method of existence, we find that it involves in itself several corollaries.

It demands the postulation of an eternal existence as the First Cause of all causes. Without this uncaused beginning of causation there could be no existence at all except external existence.

It demands for every effect an adequate cause. Otherwise, a part of the effect would be an uncaused existence.

It demands that every cause must produce its full effect, except so far as its power is counteracted, that is, diverted, by other causes resisting its operation.

Like causes, operating under like circumstances, must produce like effects. Otherwise the law would not be universal and invariable.

There can never be any more evolved in the effect than was involved in the cause; but there may be more involved in a cause than is put forth in producing a given effect; that is, a part of the power of the cause may be unexerted, and retained as unused power.

11. It is on the law of causation, as the necessary method of existence, that the modern method of scientific experiments for the acquisition of knowledge is made possible. What is the boasted experimental philosophy of the present age, with its

methods of scientific experiments, but a search for causes from known effects, or of effects from known causes? And how does the experimenting scientist, when his experiment gives a result, know that the result may not be an accidental and fortuitous manifestation, except on the law that the same cause in the same circumstances must always produce the same effect? The law of causation as the invariable method of existence, and of changes in existence, is the corner-stone upon which the whole system of the experimental philosophy is founded.

But we have already seen that the mind does not acquire its knowledge of the law of causation, as the invariable method of existence, from experience, but that it springs into existence, as a primitive conviction, as soon as the first external occasion calls for it. Thus, the so-called Experimental Philosophy is founded on a principle that is found to lie outside the range of experience. And now, further, the fundamental principle on which the Experimental Philosophy is based, when followed to its consequences, carries its field beyond the range of experience and the reach of experiment. A man's knowledge, by the law of causation as the method of existence, is carried beyond the field of his personal experience; and, on the same law, human knowledge is found to be wider than the

experience of mankind. Man knows, over and above the actual facts of his observation—the objects of his experience—all that he deduces from those facts as immediate inferences and syllogistic conclusions. The Experimental Philosophy, on its own terms, must admit as true whatever is necessarily inferred from the facts of experience and the demonstrations of experiments. This will carry Philosophy into the admission of truths of which man, in his present condition, has had no experience, and which he cannot bring under experiment by any contrivance or instruments as yet at his command. The observed and admitted facts of astronomy as to the magnitude and movements of the heavenly bodies necessitate the inference that there are other heavenly bodies which cannot be seen by the most powerful telescopes. Here man's knowledge, based upon the facts of his experience, extends far beyond the range of his experience and the reach of his experiments.

No man has ever seen a soul, but facts of our mental and moral experience necessitate the inference that souls do exist. Here, again, man's knowledge, based on his experience, extends beyond the range of his experience and the reach of his experiment.

No man has ever seen the essence of matter; but

man knows the properties of matter as facts of his experience, and he has brought many of the properties of matter under his experiments; and he knows, as a necessary inference, that matter as an entity does exist. Here, again, his knowledge, growing out of the facts of his experience, extends beyond the range of his experience and the reach of all possible experiments. Man's knowledge of the existence of matter as an entity is only inferential.

No man has seen God at any time; but facts of human experience necessitate the inference that God exists as the Eternal Person of the universe. Here, again, man's knowledge, based upon the facts of his experience, extends beyond the range of his experience and the reach of all conceivable experiments. Man's knowledge of God is inferential; but his knowledge of the essence of his own body and of the entity of this material world, is also inferential. The greater part, and the best part of all man's knowledge, is inferential. It is by his inferences that man knows more than the beasts that perish. It is his power of inferential knowledge that elevates man into a whole realm of life and enjoyments above the highest possibilities of the dumb creatures, which cannot think of the God who made them, nor of a life to come.

There is something more in this universe than that which can be measured and weighed; there is man, who measures the extension and weighs the ponderosity of things: there is something more than what can be seen and felt; there is man, who sees the visible and feels the invisible: there is something more than experience and experiment; there is man, who experiences and who experiments. And man from the observed facts of his experience infers the existence of other facts of which he can have no sensational experience. These inferred facts are as real and trustworthy as the observed facts. Man is not merely an observer of phenomena; he is a reasoner. The actual facts of sensational experience and experiments are not the boundaries and limitations of human knowledge.



INTRODUCTION.
THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Every house is builded by some one ; but he that built all things is God. He that built the house hath more honor than the house. We look for a city that hath foundations, whose architect and builder is God.—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

GOD as the self-existent and eternal Person who created all things, man as a created and immortal person, the Bible as God's Word inspired in the words of men, and Christ as the living Saviour of a dead world, are the fundamental facts on which Christianity is founded. On these four great facts the temple of Christian faith and worship is erected as upon four solid foundations, lying one upon another. We say foundations and not corner-stones, because a corner-stone supports one corner of an edifice, and does not underlie the whole superstructure. A corner-stone might be taken out without destroying the building, but if the foundation be removed the edifice must fall. Each of the great facts enumerated above underlies the whole system of Christianity, and if either should be left out, the whole temple of our religion would fall to pieces and crumble into ruins. They are not detached corner-

stones, but foundations, resting one upon another, each underlying every essential doctrine of Christianity.

The bottom foundation of all is the being of God as the eternal Person who created and governs the universe. This fact makes religion possible. If God be only unconscious matter, or impersonal force in matter, then man has nothing to fear nor to revere. A universe without a Personal God enthroned at its center is an endless concatenation of fatal causes and effects. In such a universe there can be no room for religion. There would be no supreme authority to be obeyed, nor supreme majesty to be adored. Religion is the worship of the Supreme Person by dependent persons.

Unless man is a created person he is incapable of religion. Religion consists in the obedience and adoration of a created person for his Personal Creator. The existence of a Personal God makes religion possible, provided there be intelligent and responsible creatures to worship him. But is it necessary that the intelligent and responsible creatures should be immortal in order to render them capable of religion, and to make religion obligatory upon them? If man's existence be limited to this life of mortal breath, then the highest form of his religion could be only a species of morality, in

which the apparent expediency of the moment would be the highest motive to control his conduct, or to order his worship. If there be no life of compensations to follow the present fleeting and uncertain existence, then man's highest duty would be to get the highest and best self-gratification out of the passing hour. His only reasonable motto would be, "Let us eat and drink to-day, for to-morrow we die." If man be not an immortal person, then it is his right and his duty to get the highest self-gratification obtainable in the present life. Selfishness would be the law of his being, and self-gratification the chief end of his existence. To require anything more of man would be unreasonable and oppressive. Could we call such a life of selfishness religious? It is scarcely moral. But this is the highest that can be demanded of man, if it be all of life to live and all of death to die. If in this life only man has hope, he is of all creatures the most miserable. If man be only a superior beast, he can be under no more obligation to worship God than the beasts that perish. If man is not an immortal person, he is not capable of religion in any true sense of the word; nor does he need it. But in our second lecture we will find that man is a created and immortal person; and, consequently, religion for him is possible, and also reasonable and necessary.

On the two fundamental facts, that God is the self-existent and eternal Person of the universe and man a created and immortal person, a system of what is called natural religion might be founded ; but man, in his present condition, is conscious that a system of natural religion is utterly insufficient for his necessities. Man is conscious of sin, and left to the light of nature he can neither discover how he came to be a sinner, nor how he can escape from the guilt and pollution of his sin. Man is conscious that he has fallen into sin, and that sin has estranged his life from God, and that he cannot reason out from the light of nature a way of return and restoration to God's favor. In this way he is brought to the conviction that, if he is to have a true and saving religion, God must speak to him more clearly than he has spoken in the works of external nature, or in the workings of his own internal consciousness and reason. In this way man is prepared to receive a divine revelation from heaven to teach him how he may direct his life aright in its relations to his God and to his fellow-creatures. This needed revelation man finds in the Bible, which is presented to him as God's Word inspired in men's words. This Book is in human language, so that man can read and understand it ; but it is not the product of human reason. It re-

veals to man the truths concerning his God and himself which it is necessary for him to know in order to his salvation, but which his reason, unenlightened by this divine revelation, could never have discovered. But the divine revelation of this Book is addressed to man's reason, and he is to read and interpret it by his reason, and thus to learn from it his reasonable religion. The Bible, as the Word of God in the words of men, is the third fundamental fact on which Christianity is founded. This third foundation rests upon the two preceding foundations, God's personality and man's immortality, which underlies and makes possible the Bible as a divine revelation from God the eternal Person to man the immortal person. Christianity is in no sense a human philosophy reasoned out by man, but is a divine revelation made to man's reason. He cannot admit into the system of Christian faith and worship anything not contained in the Bible, nor reject anything contained in the Bible from it.

We open the Bible and we find that it contains the inspired revelation of the divine plan of man's salvation from sin and death unto immortal life, through the redemption of Jesus Christ, the living Saviour of the dead world. We find these two great facts clearly revealed: first, that the world

is dead in sin; and second, that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but might have everlasting life. This great truth, salvation for a dead world, the redemption of sinful men, through the life and death of Jesus Christ on earth, is the last foundation on which our Christianity stands. This great truth, which is the sum and substance of the Bible as a divine revelation, underlies the whole system of Christianity. It is not a corner-stone supporting one corner of the edifice, nor sills supporting the walls, but the broad foundation underlying all the corners, all the walls, and the whole area of the temple of our Christian faith and worship. Whenever one stands in the temple of Christianity, he stands on this great and all-underlying foundation-fact—Jesus Christ, the living Saviour of the dead world.

These four foundations, resting one upon another, are, after all, one and the same rock, the rock of eternal truth, on which our Christianity is founded. God, the self-existent and eternal Person, is the rock that lies at the bottom and underlies the whole system. He created man, an immortal person, in his own image, and thus made him capable of religion. Man's immortality is the rock of God's eternal personality appearing in the life

of the person created in his image. The Bible is the impregnable rock of God's Word placed under fallen man to keep him from sinking into despair and endless death. Jesus Christ, the living Saviour of the world of dead souls, is God appearing in human life as the Rock of Ages, cleft for man as a refuge from the death of sin. The whole system, the foundations upon foundations, are hewn out of one solid rock—God the eternal Person saving man the created and immortal person. The great Sphinx of Gizeh is not a detached statue, but is a mysterious image hewn out of the solid rock on which it stands, and of which it is an unbroken part. The human head, the lion's body, and the stone-cut temple underneath, are all one solid rock. Just so it is with our Christianity: the foundations and the superstructure are all one solid rock, one eternal truth presented in various manifestations, God creating man in his own image, and then, when man had fallen into sin, redeeming him by entering into his life, and thereby lifting him out of his death. The rock of Egypt is a dead rock shaped into the image of man, but the rock of Christianity is a living rock, the Rock that restores life and the image of the living God to men dead in sin.

CHAPTER FIRST.

IS GOD AN ETERNAL PERSON?

“There is no need of abstruse reasonings and distinctions to convince an unprejudiced understanding that there is a God who made and governs the world, and who will judge it in righteousness; though it may be necessary to answer abstruse difficulties when once such are raised; when the very meaning of those words which express most intelligibly the general doctrine of religion is pretended to be uncertain, and the clear truth of the thing itself is obscured by the intricacies of speculation.”—BISHOP BUTLER.

THE FIRST QUESTION.

IS GOD AN ETERNAL PERSON?

THE aim of this lecture is to answer the ancient questions, *An sit Deus?* and *Quid sit Deus?*—Is there a God? and, What is God?

In my search for the true answers of these great questions I begin with myself, the first great fact of consciousness.

I know that I now exist, and that I think, feel, and will, and that I am responsible for my actions. My memory carries my knowledge of myself back into the past, and I know that I have not always existed—at least, that I have not always existed just as I am now. Then, on the great law of thought, that every contingent existence must have an adequate cause, I know that there is a Cause that called me into being and that sustains my existence. That Cause must possess in itself all the powers and potencies that I find in myself; otherwise, it would not be an adequate cause.

I find in myself consciousness and conscientiousness, intelligence, emotions, and a free will; in short, I find that I am an intelligent and responsible person. Therefore, the power that called me into existence must be an intelligent and moral Person, because there never can be more evolved in the effect than is involved in its cause.

This is the anthropological argument, and it gives me, as my Creator, an intelligent Person, who is, by virtue of his being my Creator, the moral Sovereign of my life.

As the second great fact of my consciousness, I know that I exist in the midst of an external world. I look out upon the world around me and I see that all things are in a constant state of flux and change. Now, I know that whatever changes must have a cause to produce the change, and that whatever powers and potencies are manifested in or by the changes must be included in their cause. I see in the changes going on around me, and in the marks of the changes of past ages, order, system, and design. I know that there cannot be order without an ordainer, nor system without a systematizer, nor design without a designer. All this implies not only thought, but

also forethought; and not only will, but a will guided by wisdom. Therefore the Maker of the world must be a Power that thinks and designs, and wills and acts with a purpose.

This is the cosmological argument, and it gives us, as the Creator and Sustainer of the world, a rational Person possessing power to perform his purposes.

Considering my own being and the being of all things around me, I find that all existences are divided into two great classes, the conscious and the unconscious. First, there is unconscious dead matter. It is inert, having no power in itself to put itself into motion if at rest, or to arrest its movements if in motion. But when I consider the plants and trees around me, I find a species of matter that is not dead and yet is unconscious and incapable of self-motion. I find in the growing plant a mysterious power of self-development. It causes the plant to increase in size, to clothe itself with leaves, to adorn itself with blooms, and to load itself with fruit. This proceeds from a vital force which, in the present state of human knowledge, is inexplicable. There is in it a power of self-motion in the way of growth, but

the life of the plant does not overcome the inertia of its material substance. The living tree is just as incapable of self-motion as the dead tree. The power of vital movement in the living tree seems to be a something apart from the substance of the tree itself. It is a power that absorbs from the soil substances which it spins and weaves into the body of the tree. Here we have come upon the mystery of life.

I now consider the animals around me, and I find in them a higher form of life. I find life that is self-conscious, and that imparts to the substances in which it inheres the power of self-motion. The live animal is conscious of its life, and it possesses in itself power to move itself from place to place. I am conscious of this animal life in myself. Whatever more I may be, I know that I am an animal. In my observation, I see that plants germinate into life and then die and decay, and that animals are born into life, and soon they die and pass away ; hence I know that life, as manifested in plants and animals, is a contingent existence ; and therefore life must have a cause ; and the cause of life must be life itself, because all that is evolved in the effect must be involved in

the cause. Therefore the self-existent Cause of all things must be eternal Life.

I know that life inheres in matter as I see it in plants and animals, but I believe that it may inhere in mind apart from matter. I am conscious of the presence and activities of a life within me—a life of connected and continued thought and of voluntary moral action—that cannot be accounted for and explained as the mere animal life of the material substances of which my body is composed. Therefore, there is a life of mind different from, and superior to, the life of matter. The life that is eternal, the life that is the Cause of all other life, must be life of the highest order. Therefore, God, the self-existent and eternal Person, must be a living Spirit.

This is the ontological argument, and it gives us a self-living Spirit as the eternal Person who created all things and who is the sole and supreme moral Ruler of the universe.

Our God is the eternally living Spirit. In this conclusion the vast majority of mankind in all ages has rested, believing and acting upon the belief that there is a God who is the self-existent and eternal Person—the living Spirit who created

and who governs the universe. But in every age there have been a few, always a very small minority, who have dissented from this conclusion, and who present themselves before the world as atheists, who say there is no God, or as agnostics, who say that men can never know whether or not there is a God. This being so, we cannot rest our argument here in the almost unanimous conclusion of the common sense of mankind, but must go on and meet and refute the attacks that have been made upon this argument by atheistic philosophers and agnostic scientists.

The philosophy of Kant threw a shadow of suspicion upon the argument by which the mind advances from causation to God as the great First Cause of all causes. That shadow hung over it for a season. He characterized it as a specious sophism, while admitting that it is the necessary conclusion of the logical progress of reason. This involved him in the dreadful doctrine that our reason is so constituted that it necessarily seduces us into error. It was intuitively felt that there must be a fallacy in the philosophy that involved a doctrine so fatal to the trustworthiness of the conclusions of reason. That fallacy has been

found and exploded. It consisted in Kant's regarding the law of causation as only the subjective condition of thought, and not as the method of both subjective and objective existence. The fact is, our minds conceive of the law of causation, not merely as an abstract principle, but as the concrete method of all existences. On this conception, Kant's criticism falls to the ground. But let no one suppose for a moment that Emmanuel Kant, the great philosopher of Königsberg, was an atheist. Far from it; he was not even skeptical as to God's existence and the soul's immortality. He bowed down on the loftiest summit of his transcendental philosophy and worshiped God as the Creator of the world and the Sovereign of the soul, believing in him on the moral testimony of his conscience.

The modern system of the Experimental Philosophy, under the able leadership of the late John Stuart Mill, has earnestly attacked the cosmological argument, so far as it is based upon the conception of a First Cause. But Mr. Mill, while attempting to discredit the argument from the etiological point of view, gives full credit to its teleological aspect. He says: "It must be

allowed that in the present state of our knowledge the adaptations in nature afford a large balance in favor of creation by intelligence." Mr. Mill was not an atheist. He did not accept the law of causation as a datum of consciousness, but only as a general conviction acquired through experience. His mind did not see any necessary connection between cause and effect beyond the uniformity of antecedent and sequence, as a fact of observation. He says: "It is a necessary part of the fact of causation *within the sphere of our experience* that the causes as well as effects had a beginning in time, and were themselves caused. It would seem, therefore, that our *experience*, instead of furnishing an argument for a *First Cause*, is repugnant to it; and that the very essence of causation *as it exists within the limits of our knowledge*, is incompatible with a *First Cause*." It will be observed that Mr. Mill in this famous paragraph inserts the word *knowledge* in the closing sentence as synonymous with *experience*, twice used in preceding sentences. This assumes that the sphere of our knowledge is identical with the sphere of our experience, and never transcends it. Grant this, and it will make Mr. Mill's argu-

ment logical. Otherwise, it is a *petitio principii*—a clear begging of the question. But our knowledge is wider than our experience. It embraces the whole field of experience, the data of consciousness, and the facts of observation, and, in addition thereto, the immediate inferences and the syllogistic conclusions that necessarily flow from them. Otherwise, man is not a reasoner upon facts, but a mere observer of facts.

Of course, within the sphere of our experience every cause is the effect of preceding causes; but may there not be a cause outside the sphere of experience, that is, the First Cause of all causes? Why not? Does not reason itself demand that we posit such an existence to account for the phenomenal causes and effects of experience? We must do this, or we fall into the absurdity of an infinite regression of phenomenal causes and effects. The conception of an endless series of causes and effects, going backward to a beginning that never began, is an absurdity that cannot be construed in thought. The doctrine of causation does not teach that every existence must have a cause, but that there must be an eternal and uncaused existence as the First Cause

of all phenomenal causes and effects. This is intelligible. Mr. Mill's doctrine is not intelligible. If Mr. Mill could construe his doctrine as a clear proposition in his own mind, he must have had a mind differently constituted from the minds of men in general. The truth is, he deceived himself by the witchery of his own words. The same witchery of words has deceived his disciples. Clear definition is all that is needed to refute his philosophy. There must have been a First Cause, or there could not have been a second cause, nor a series of secondary and phenomenal causes and effects.

But the First Cause may be only blind force inherent in eternal matter; then, what we call creation is only an evolution out of matter, produced by this force acting in unconscious movements. But can this theory account for the thought and the forethought, the order of intelligent purpose, and the designs of discriminating will, everywhere seen in nature, and for the existence of man as a free intelligence on the earth? It cannot, unless there could be more evolved in the effect than was involved in the cause. Every cause produces its own effect, and cannot

produce anything else. Our experience teaches us this, and will not allow us to believe to the contrary. Wheat produces wheat, and not rye. Potatoes produce potatoes, and not pumpkins. And so on, throughout all nature, without a shadow of variation. When oxygen and hydrogen gases are combined in proper proportions, they produce water; and there can be no element in the water thus produced that was not in the gases producing it. Disprove this law, which is an essential principle involved in the law of causation, then, immediately, the whole edifice of modern science, the glory of man, will fall to pieces. Therefore, there must be a First Cause that started the series of phenomenal causes and effects, and that keeps it going; and that First Cause must be an eternal existence that involves in itself all the powers and potencies that exist in the causes and effects that issue from it. This First Cause, whatever it may be, is the God of the universe.

What is this First Cause? We come now to the question, *Quid sit Deus?*—What is God? Is this First Cause material in its nature? Or is it a complex being, a spiritual essence in a material

substance? Or is it pure Spirit? One or the other of these three it must be.

We have already found good reason for believing that the First Great Cause of all things is eternal Spirit—the self-existent Person who is the Creator and supreme Ruler of the universe. But we must now take up this question again, for we are now answering objections that have been raised against the almost unanimous conclusion of the common sense of mankind. But as we go on, let us remember that ninety-nine per cent. of the human race concur in the conclusion to which our argument is to bring us.

To suppose that the eternal existence, the Cause of all things, is purely material, is to adopt the hypothesis of materialism. On this hypothesis there is nothing in the universe but matter. Now our experience has taught us that inertia is a fundamental law of matter; that is, matter at rest can never move itself, and matter in motion can never arrest its own movement. But we find all matter in motion—the worlds are ceaselessly moving around in their orbits. This is called astronomical motion. What started that motion? Matter cannot start itself to moving.

On our earth we find matter moving in three kinds of motion, known as locomotion, and molar and molecular movements. We find matter in living animal organisms moving itself from place to place, and find that dead masses of matter are moved by external force from place to place, and that the atoms of bodies are perpetually moving and changing their relations to one another. If there is nothing in the universe but matter, how did this motion begin? How was the law of inertia overcome? This is the first, but not the greatest, problem that pure materialism has to solve. One solution offered is known as the nebulous hypothesis. It seeks to find the origin of all motion in molecular motion, the movements of the molecules or atoms of bodies. This theory is held upon both an atheistic and a theistic basis. We are at present only concerned in showing the insufficiency of the theory in its atheistic aspect.

Molecular motion is due to the chemical affinity or repulsion of molecules for one another. But the atom, so far forth as it is a minute particle of matter, is subject to the law of inertia; and unless it was eternally related to another

atom so as to set the chemical force in operation from all eternity, there is no conceivable way in which it could, in the face of the known law of inertia, move itself into such a relation. It would be just as possible for the heavenly bodies, as immense masses, to set themselves in motion as for atomic particles to set themselves in motion. If matter is eternal, and if there is nothing in the world but matter and motion, then motion must be eternal as well as matter. We cannot find the cause of motion in matter, any more than we can find the cause of matter in motion. Is the universe, then, eternal matter in eternal motion? The motion, then, must be either motion at random or motion by invariable law: motion at random would plunge the universe into endless confusion and countless collisions; and unconscious motion by invariable law must necessarily be motion in perpetual cycles, motion perpetually repeating itself. But the observation of our experience does not give us motion in either of these orders. We see such a uniformity in the movements of particles, masses, and worlds that we know that motion is not at random; and yet we see such a variety and conflict in motions

that we know that all motions do not move in cycles, and hence motion is something more than a perpetual repetition of itself. But upon the theory that eternal matter in eternal motion constitutes the universe, the most inexplicable of all movements is locomotion and the voluntary movements of beasts and men. Here the theory of eternal matter in eternal motion, involving, as it necessarily does, the doctrine that all motions and mutations are enchained in the adamantine links of a material and mechanical concatenation of causes and effects, utterly breaks down.

Some have thought to escape from this entanglement by hypothecating eternal Force, inherent in eternal matter. But this hypothecates a something in the universe over and above, and additional to, matter and motion: a Cause, different from though immanent in matter, that produces motion. What is this, then, but making Force, a something that is not matter, the producing cause, and matter the material cause, of the universe? This hypothesis involves the distinct abandonment of the theory of pure and unmixed materialism. This eternal Force is not matter, but power that moves matter. But does this

eternal Force, immanent in matter, move matter aimlessly and blindly? If so, how then can we account for the order and design manifested in matter and its movements? Ordination and design are the unquestionable products of thought and forethought. Where there is thought, there must be a thinker. The law that demands an adequate cause for every effect requires this conclusion. Then the eternal Force cannot be an attribute of matter unless matter can think. Can matter think? There is thought in the universe. Man thinks. Thought is written on the stars of heaven and engraven upon the rocks of the earth. Can matter think? Can force as an attribute of matter think? This is the second, the greatest problem that materialism has to solve. John Locke, the father of the sensational theory of human knowledge on which the modern system of Experimental Philosophy is grounded, says: "I appeal to every man's own thoughts, whether he cannot as easily conceive matter to be produced by nothing, as thought to be produced by matter, when before there was no such thing as an intelligent being existing." The Force that created this universe, including thinking man,

must be a power that thinks; and hence, must be Mind or Spirit.

Man, the finite thinker, is a created spirit incorporated in a body. Shall we say that God, the infinite Thinker, is the eternal Spirit immanent in matter? They say man is a microcosm, a mind in matter, constituting a little world; and that God is the macrocosm, the Infinite Mind immanent in eternal matter, constituting the universe. But do they speak wisely? They utter, consciously or unconsciously, the doctrine of pantheism. If God is the Eternal Spirit immanent in eternal matter—the power that produces all material motions and mutations—then God is everything, and all things together are God. Then creation is only an evolution, and an evolution that does not augment matter but only changes its forms and movements. On this theory there is no creation, and there can be no free will nor moral responsibility. But man knows that he is a free intelligence, and that he is responsible for his actions. His consciousness, involving conscientiousness, contradicts and refutes the cheerless pantheism that makes God, as the eternal Spirit immanent in eternal matter, the

macrocosm, and man a microcosm. God is not the universe, nor is man a little world. Man is only one of the countless creatures in the universe which God has created and over which he reigns as the moral Sovereign of free intelligences.

But how are we to explain the physical axiom, *Ex nihilo nihil fit*? We are to receive it as our experience gives it to us, as the law of changes in created matter. The eternal Spirit is the Creator of existences, while secondary causes, which fall under our experience, are only productive of changes in existences. Absolute creation lies outside the realm of our experience, but the facts of experience necessitate the inference of an absolute creation at the beginning of all things. There is nothing absurd in the thought that the eternal Spirit created matter by projecting his power into material actualities. Because we know that matter cannot think, and because we know that there is thought and forethought in the order and designs of nature, therefore we must conclude that the First Cause of all things is Mind and not matter, and, as such, the Creator of matter in all its forms and with all its potencies.

Man finds in his own mind an adumbration of the creative power of the eternal Mind. I know that I think and that I will, and that my volitions are free and self-originated. In my consciousness, I know that I am not under the law of a physical determinism. By my free volitions I originate my actions and control them, and that, too, contrary to all possibilities of prevision, and independent of all physical antecedents. All this I know on the immediate testimony of my consciousness, and not as the result of argument in which there might possibly be a flaw. This testimony of consciousness is the end of controversy. Man is free, and his volitions do not stand in the row of phenomenal causes and effects. His will is a subordinate power of causation. His volitions are not caused, but are causative. Man creates his own actions. They are not links in the chain of physical causation. Only such actions as are consciously self-originated, and knowingly directed to a purpose, can be said to be voluntary. Free will, involving the doctrine of volitions uncaused but causative, is the diadem of glory that crowns the life of man. It lifts him above the beasts, and links

him into fellowship with the life of God—the Eternal and uncaused Cause of all phenomenal causes and effects.

But man himself is not uncaused, but the Great First Cause in his creation has given him a subordinate power of causation, the power of free and self-originated volition. Otherwise, he is not a free intelligence, and cannot be a responsible person. This subordinate power of causation in man is proof of the absolute power of creation in the God who made him. Mind in man does not create matter, but it controls it and directs its movements. The volition of my will, which I may withhold or put forth at my own pleasure, lifts my hands and moves my feet. I can do what I will, and go where I wish, under the necessary restrictions of the conditions of my life. To this extent there is creative power in my mind—in myself. I create my own actions; otherwise, I would not be responsible for them. And beyond this, man can create a whole world, and people it with the personages of his own creation. The dramatic poet, Shakespeare, for instance, creates a world and peoples it with the characters of his own creation. The word poet

is in Greek ποιητης, from ποιειν, to make. The poet is a subordinate creator. Now let the imagination go one step in advance of the facts, and suppose that the poet, or novelist, had power to give material and permanent actuality to the creation of his genius, and we have, not a proof, but an illustration of the way in which God may have created the universe. But this much we know as a necessary inference, that all the powers and potencies in man existed first in his Creator; and we can readily conceive how God in creation may have projected from himself his created power in the permanent essences and forms of physical and psychical existences and actualities. This power is not in man, but there is in him an adumbration of it. God is greater than man. There must be in God greater power than the highest in man.

But we come back from fancies to facts, from poetry to philosophy. Locke has laid down the principle as incontrovertible: "What is first of all things must necessarily contain in itself, and actually have, at least all the perfections that can ever exist." Then, whatever is in man, except his imperfections, must exist in God his Creator.

We go further and say that the very imperfections of man must have originated in a power in man that is godlike and good in itself. All man's imperfections have their roots in his sin, and his sin sprung out of his free will. As there is free will in man, there must be free will in God. God is the Free Will of the universe.

James Martineau says: "Our whole idea of Power is identical with that of Will, or reduced from it. . . . Therefore, after weighing all objections, I persist in regarding that which the natural philosopher calls *force*, and Professor Tyndall raises to an immanent *life*, as Causal Will, manifesting itself, not in interference with an established order, but in producing it. . . . A power which is not Mind, yet may be 'potential' and exist when and where it makes no sign; which is 'immanent' in matter, yet *is* matter; which is manifested in the universe, yet is not 'a Cause,' therefore has no effects—presents to me, not an overshadowing mystery, but an assemblage of contradictions." Then, if all power is lodged in a self-moving will, and if God is the Eternal Causal Will of the universe, man, created in the divine image, is a subordinate power of causa-

tion, and his causative power is lodged in his will. The volitions of man's free will are uncaused, but causative. They are self-originated, and do not take their position in the row of causal necessities. How else can they be free? If not free, that is, self-caused, how can man be held responsible for doing what he chooses to do? But man himself is not an uncaused being; but God, in creating him, has endowed him with subordinate power of causation. His free will, volition uncaused but causative, is the diadem of glory that crowns his life with his personal responsibility. In this way alone is sin a possibility. If sin does not have its origin in the power of subordinate causation, lodged in the free will of man as a causative energy, then God must be the author of sin. Sin becomes possible in that very power in which man is most like his God—in man's subordinate power of causation.

We find the highest dignity of man in his consciousness of his conscience. Man knows that there is a right and a wrong, and that he ought to do the right and to avoid the wrong. This word "ought" is the highest in human language. It grows out of man's ineradicable sense of moral

obligation. This implies that there is a moral authority over his life, which he is bound, in the very condition of his existence, to obey. God is infolded and implied as an immediate inference in the significance of the great word "ought"; and he is implied in it as the moral Sovereign over the life of man. If there is no God in heaven as the moral Sovereign of the universe, this word must be blotted out of human language. Blot this word out, and four fifths of all the books ever written by man will go out of existence with it. It is the heart that pulsates in all human literature. Suppress this word, and all literature will fall prostrate in the dust of earth, just like a man whose heart had ceased to beat. This conscientiousness of which all sane men are conscious—this sense of moral obligation which is ineradicable in human consciousness—is the final argument that we present to prove that there is God, and that God is the moral Sovereign of human life. This sense of moral obligation infolds and implies the existence of two moral persons, lawfully related to one another as Sovereign and subject. If I am morally obligated, I must be obligated to some one who has

moral authority over my life—not to an abstract principle, but to a Person who can take knowledge of, and punish me for, any willful violation of my moral duty. We are not talking about what are usually called the laws of nature, such as the laws of gravitation, inertia, and motion; they may mean nothing more than the uniformity of the modes of existence and movement. We are now speaking of moral laws, which men can and do disregard. There cannot be a moral law without a lawful authority to give the law, and a lawful subject to whom the law is given. The moral law, of which we are just as conscious as we are of our own existence, is indisputable evidence that there is a personal God who is the moral Sovereign of the universe.

That there is a God is the conclusion alike of the highest science and of the deepest philosophy, and of the plain common sense of mankind in general. There are many who do not conceive of God as you and I do, but they are not atheists. They believe in God as they conceive him. Darwin was not an atheist, nor was Hume, nor Gibbon, nor Voltaire, nor even Tom Paine. Colonel Ingersoll is not an atheist; neither is he

a scholar or a philosopher. He is a sentimentalist. Mill, Spencer, and Huxley are not atheists. They call themselves agnostics, and say that philosophy and science cannot prove nor disprove the existence of a God. Herbert Spencer, the prince of them all, stands forth as the philosopher of the unknowable; and his philosophy of the unknowable is itself, for the most part, unknowable. His disciples to-day do not know whether it is to be counted on the side of theism or atheism; some of them are trying to push it into atheism, and some are trying to pull it into theism. The science of the sciences of the closing half of this nineteenth century is not atheistic; nor are its best representatives. It is not the Huxleys nor the Tyndalls nor the Darwins who are the real leaders of scientific thought of our age. These men are specialists, and have their minds biased in certain trends of thought. When they enter the field of the philosophy of science—the science of the sciences—they have upon their minds the bent of their favorite studies. They are not to be followed blindly in conclusions based upon premises drawn most largely from departments with which they are

not over-familiar. Specialists are not considered as high authorities on points outside their special departments. A man who makes cotton-raising his specialty in life is not an agriculturist in the true sense of the word. Suppose that the scientific cotton-raiser should say, "I know all about cotton, from the seed to the lint, and there is no bread of life in it—nothing that a man can eat and live upon. I will not go so far as to say that there is nothing in all the possible products of agriculture to support human life, but I will say, as a scientific agriculturist, I have not found in all my researches any such substance; and as to the existence of such an agricultural substance, I am an agnostic—I neither affirm nor deny." Would such a statement, from such an agricultural authority, shake the faith of your common sense in corn, wheat, barley, potatoes, rice, sugar, and the ten thousand other agricultural products on which men live and thrive? Now, Mr. Huxley is a palæontologist, and in his department he is a scientific authority. In it he has made valuable discoveries. But when he comes forward and says, "I know all about shells and fossils; I am a scientific expert, and I

find in them no God, no soul, no immortality, no religion; and now I declare, as a scientist, so far as my experience and my experiments go, there is no God in science, nor substance of religion, and therefore, so far as the existence of God and the immortality of the soul are concerned, I am an agnostic—I neither affirm nor deny,”—would such a declaration, from such an authority, shake your faith? I would reply to all such as Mr. Huxley: “You are a specialist in science, but not a real scientist in the high sense of the word. In your special department, taken by itself, there may be no proof of the existence of God, but in all nature there is; and even your department, when studied in its relations with all others, may furnish important links in the chain of evidence that proves that there is a Personal God in heaven, who is the Creator and Sovereign of all men on earth.”

Turning away from the specialists, I look up higher, and on the summit of the mountain of science, and on the loftiest peaks of the hill of philosophy, I see the Helmholtzes, the Wundts, the Lotzes, the Pasteurs, the La Granges, the Navilles, the Beales, the Dawsons, the Copes,

the Danas, the Grays, the Agassizes, the Henries, the Kants, the Hamiltons, a great multitude too numerous to mention, from Europe, from Asia, from Africa, from America, and from the isles of the seas, and they are all down upon their knees, reverently and humbly worshiping the God of philosophy and science, whom they declare to be the living God of our Christianity. In the valleys and on the mountain-slopes, from base to summit, I see a vast and countless multitude of men, men of plain common sense and men of all grades of scholarship and thought, all bowing and worshiping the God who made them, and to whom they owe their lives. With this vast company of great men and of common men, with the kings and princes of science so exalted in knowledge and so humble in faith, with the men lowly in knowledge but lofty in faith, with the army of martyrs and confessors, with the good and godly of all ages, we bow down and worship the uncreated Spirit—the First Cause of all causes—the self-existent and eternal Person, who is the Almighty Maker and Supreme Ruler of the universe.

CHAPTER SECOND.
IS MAN AN IMMORTAL SOUL?

“ Thought and extension have no points in common. Matter is essentially divisible, consciousness essentially indivisible. This proves that the soul is naturally immortal—that is, incapable of destruction by any natural causes. The simplicity of its being precludes dissolution, and that is the only form of destruction with which we are acquainted.”—JAMES H. THORNWELL, D.D.

THE SECOND QUESTION.

IS MAN AN IMMORTAL SOUL?

THERE are some questions that never grow stale nor lose their power of fascination by the lapse of time. The question of man's immortality is the most fascinating of these undying questions. It is as old as the race, and yet it is forever as fresh as the dew of a new-born morning, and as fascinating as the first rays of the sun just rising out of the darkness of night. It can never lose its power to charm the hearts of men while they value their manhood, because it involves all that makes men superior to the beasts that perish in death. There comes a time in every one's experience when this question, at all times interesting, pierces the heart to the very core and fills it with an interest so tremendous and awful that for the moment all other questions are forgotten. When we are called upon to close in death the eyes that once beamed in the light and love of

life, and to kiss cold and speechless lips that once spoke the words of love and sweetness but can never again respond to our kisses, and to lay away in the silent grave, dust to dust, the lifeless form that is so loved for the sweet life that once lived in it, we cannot help asking, with our bleeding hearts in the question, "Does this death of the body end all? Is it our loved one that we here bury forever from our sight?" Our hearts answer, "No; our loved one was more than this mortal body which we here shut up in the lonely tomb; she is an immortal soul, and she has gone into that life that is never darkened by the shadow of death; and there we shall meet and know and love one another again in the life that never ends."

It is our purpose in the present lecture to show that this hope of immortal life, which is man's only comfort against the supreme sadness of this mortal life, rests upon a solid foundation which reason builds under the feet of dying men, to keep them from sinking down into dumb despair when death tears their loved ones from their arms that fall helpless by their sides. Our question is not, Has man an immortal soul? That doctrine

would shed a ray of hope upon the darkness of the tomb, suggesting that, after the sleep of death, the soul would awake, in the morning of the resurrection, to life and consciousness again. That dim and far-off hope is insufficient to ease the aching heart as the feet turn away from the new-made grave in which the loved form of a departed one has just been laid away to rest in the sleep of death. Our question is, Is man an immortal soul? Is the soul the real man, and the body only the house in which the man tabernacles during the sojourn of this mortal life? We undertake to prove that the soul within the body is the real man, and that man is a created and immortal person. The argument of this lecture is built upon the conclusions reached in the preceding lecture, the eternal personality of God being the foundation on which our hope of personal immortality rests.

We now know that there is a God, and that God is the self-existent and eternal Person who is the Almighty Creator and supreme Ruler of the universe. This great truth, when once received, must be made the foundation on which all other truths rest. God is the word that ex-

plains all the enigmas of human thought. The always living God is the cause of all existences, properties, and motions, and the fountain of all life, thought, and activity. Everything springs from God, and nothing can be thoroughly comprehended until it is traced back to God as its source.

Man, having found the cause of his being in God who created him, and who is, consequently, the Sovereign of his life, takes up the ancient questions of the race—What am I? whence came I? and whither go I?—under a light which, if faithfully followed, will lead him to the true answers. Man knows that he is an intelligent and moral person, because he thinks, feels, and wills. Thus he is conscious that he is a free intelligence, existing under moral responsibility. He knows that he has not always been; at least, that he has not always been the conscious person that he now knows himself to be. His memory goes back to a limited, but an uncertain, period in the past without ever being able to fix upon the exact moment of the beginning of his self-consciousness. He knows, however, that time was when he was not—at least, when he was not what he is now. If there

was a preëxistence of his being before the period to which his memory carries him back, he has no proof of it whatever. Therefore man knows that he, such as he is now, had a beginning. He also knows that his life, as his memory traces it back, has been full of mutations and varied vicissitudes, but that, through all changes and vicissitudes, he has always been one and the same person. He is just as conscious of the unbroken continuity of his self-identity as he is of his self-existence. The old man tottering into his grave knows that he is now the same person that once existed in the vigor of unabated manhood, in the freshness of youth, and in the feebleness of infancy. He knows that he has grown physically and developed mentally; but as his memory goes back through all the changes and vicissitudes of life, he knows that he is now, and always has been, one and the same person. He cannot even imagine that he ever was any other person than the person that he now is. Man may not be able to fix the date when he began to be a person, but he knows that from the beginning of his personal life he has always been one and the same person.

Man knows, not from his consciousness but

from his observation, that human life, since the creation of the primal pair, begins in a birth. Man knows that his life as one of the human race, but not one of the original pair, began in a birth. His birth is a well-remembered fact of human experience, though not a remembered fact of his own experience. All the facts of one's individual experience are never remembered. But where was man, and what was he, before he began to be born? This is a question for which neither memory nor present consciousness can furnish the answer. All that he can say is, if he was anywhere, or anything, before he began to be born, that prior existence, so far as his self-consciousness goes, is absolutely dissevered from his present personal existence. As the person that he now is, his existence began with the beginning of his present conscious life. He knows that he is now a self-conscious, intelligent, and responsible person; and he knows, because he knows that God is the First Cause of all things, that, such as he is, he came from God his Creator, to whom he is responsible for his actions. Man knows what he is and whence he came; but does he know, or can he know, whither he is going?

What is to become of him? He cannot help asking the question, Shall I ever cease to be? This is the question of all questions—the question which all men ask, and the one above all others for which they are most anxious to receive a satisfactory answer.

We will now proceed to interrogate all sources from which man can gather information concerning this vital question, and see if from any one of them, or from all united, we can learn the answer, or gather facts from which we can deduce the answer as an immediate inference or a syllogistic conclusion. These sources are man himself, the world around him, and God in the heavens above him.

We begin our inquiry with man himself. Is there any voice in man's consciousness, or in his perception, or in his reason, that assures him that he is an immortal soul? We put our consciousness, as it were, upon the witness-stand and hear its testimony upon the point in question. Consciousness tells us, at the very outset, that it has direct knowledge only of the present. Man may be conscious of a present memory of past events, or a present assurance of future events, but he is

not conscious of the past nor of the future. He can be conscious only of the present moment. He may know as a matter of fact, by his consciousness of a present memory, that certain things did exist in the past, and he may know, as a necessary inference or conclusion of reason from facts of which he is at present conscious, that certain things will exist in the future. Man may know much of the past and much of the future, in the conclusions of his reason from the facts of his present consciousness. Those conclusions, when reached by the reason, are present convictions in his consciousness. Man is now conscious of present life, but his consciousness cannot assure him of an endless future life. But some say that man is conscious of a present intuitive conviction that he will live forever. Those philosophers who assert this have mistaken an instinctive hope for an intuitive conviction. We have seen that there are no innate ideas, but that there are primitive convictions born of the mind itself. They spring into existence whenever an external occasion presents a proposition of which the mind affirms them as the necessary truth. Intuition is a primitive conviction, not only that a thing is so, but that

it must be so. The truth thus affirmed is not only evident, but is self-evident. The mind cannot conceive its contrary. The immortality of man is no such self-evident truth as this.

There can be no doubt or controversy about intuitive convictions. They are self-evident. Man is not intuitively conscious of being an immortal soul; neither is he intuitively conscious that he is not an immortal person. Consciousness by itself cannot answer the question of man's immortality, either in the negative or in the affirmative. Can man's perception solve the problem of his immortality? Perception is the power by which man is made cognizant of the external world, through impressions made upon the physical senses, and by them reported to consciousness. Man's immortality, or his non-immortality, is not a fact that can be perceived by any one of his five senses, nor by all of them combined.

And now, last, we come to man's reason, and ask: Does man find in his reason a voice which solves for him the problem of his immortality? It is the office of reason to accept the data of consciousness and the facts of perception, and to compare and combine them, and to draw from

them, when thus correlated, the inferences and conclusions necessarily involved in them.

First, then, are there any known data or facts which compel the reason to draw the conclusion that man is not immortal? The first great fact, bearing upon this question, with which the reason has to deal is the fact of physical death. This fact stares man in the face, whatever way he may turn. Men are born into this world, and they die and pass out of observed existence. Does this death end all? This is the most ancient question of the race. In the oldest Book, perhaps, extant it is asked, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Experience has no affirmative answer for this question. Experiment can find no answer. But neither experience nor experiment can furnish a negative answer. A conclusive negation would silence the question. It has not been found that physical death is the end of the life of man. It has not even been found that physical death arrests the life of man. In order to reach a convincing answer, there are two preliminary questions that we must deal with: What is life? and, What is the difference between life in men and life in beasts and plants? There

are at least these three kinds of life of which man has knowledge—the vegetable, the animal, and the rational.

But life itself, even in its lowest form, is something that is beyond the touch of the finger and the light of the eye. We see its manifestations, but we cannot see life itself. It eludes the penetration of the most powerful microscope. We can come very near it, but we cannot reach life itself. We find what the scientists call bioplasm, or protoplasm, or germinal matter; but this is not life itself, but only the primordial form in which life is manifested in its operations. This protoplasm, or germinal matter, is a transparent, colorless, and glue-like substance, that appears, under the highest powers of the microscope, to be absolutely structureless. This structureless mass is not life itself, but is the primordial substance in which physical life inheres. Life in this protoplasmic mass absorbs nutrient matter, instantaneously changing dead matter into living matter by a process which no human science can imitate or explain. In this protoplasm the scientists have not found life itself, but only its most primitive manifestation. No scientist claims that proto-

plasm is life itself. Physical life is the microscopically invisible power that spins the structureless substance in which it inheres into threads, and then weaves the threads into the complicated web of vegetable tissue in plants, and of flesh and bones and an infinity of organs of coördinated designs in animals. And now, in the words of Dr. Joseph Cook of Boston, whose ideas and expressions we have already begun to use, "We affirm that we have, under the microscope, ocular demonstration that it is life that causes organization, and not organization which causes life. . . . Huxley says we fail to detect any organization in the bioplasmic mass; but there is movement in it and life. We see the movements; they must have a cause. The cause of the movements must exist before the movements. Life is before organization. But if life may exist before organization, it may exist after it, or outside it." This exposition of the relation of life to organization is a masterpiece of reasoning. It means much, but we must not draw inferences from it not involved in it, as Dr. Joseph Cook seems to do; the fact that life may exist apart from and outside organization is no evidence that it may exist apart

from or outside the bioplasmic mass of structureless matter. When the germinal mass in which the microscope has discovered the primordial form of life is exhausted, then the life, the presence of which the microscope has revealed, dies. Physical science gives us no evidence that the life which the microscope has found in the bioplasmic mass can exist apart from the bioplasmic matter in which it inheres. All that is here proven is, that physical life—the only form of life of whose immediate presence the physical eye, however aided by magnifying-glasses, can have perception—necessarily inheres in a physical substance, though it may inhere in its germinal matter prior to and after organization. Physical science proves that life may exist outside organization, but it does not prove that it can exist outside the bioplasmic mass in which it is found as an inherent power. Life must necessarily inhere in an essence that lives. We can no more conceive of life as a thing apart from the subject that lives than we can of thought as a thing apart from the mind that thinks. Physical life is not the harp nor the harper, but is the harping of the harp. Life inheres in a living being as thought inheres in a

thinking mind. Destroy the being in which life inheres, and its life perishes with it. Destroy the bioplasmic matter in which physical life inheres, and physical life perishes with it. Dr. Cook's celebrated argument, so far as the immortality of the soul is concerned, goes for nothing. It proves nothing that touches the question. It goes just as far toward proving the immortality of plants and beasts as toward proving that man is an immortal soul. The life of man that lives after his physical death is not the life of his body, but the life of his soul. We know, as a fact of experience, that the body dies. But is there a psychical life in man that survives his physical death? This is our question. Physical death is a fact of physical observation. When a man dies physically, he is physically dead. If there be no psychical life in man, then physical death ends all. The physical senses of man, and the science of physical perception through them, has no power to discover the psychical bioplasm in which soul-life inheres. The microscope, aiding the physical eye of man, cannot discover it, because it is physically indiscernible. The search for the evidence of man's immortality along the line of the phys-

ical sciences can never be successful, because it is a search on the wrong road. Physical science can neither prove nor disprove man's psychical immortality. But there are facts of consciousness which are not of a physical nature. They are not perceivable by external physical observation, but are none the less real because they are facts of our internal experience. Philosophy deals with them just as physical science deals with the material facts of external perception. Man is conscious of his own distinct self-personality. How far self-consciousness exists in mere animal life we cannot tell with precision. No doubt animals are conscious of their existence, and of certain physical impressions and impulses. If they were free intelligences, possessing the discourse of reason, they would find a way of expressing their thoughts. Animals do not talk, simply because they know nothing to talk about. They have modes of expressing all their impressions. They are not capable of self-reflection and introspection. It is in this capacity that man's superiority over them begins. Man, by his introspection, finds that he is a person separate and distinct from all other persons and things.

He knows that he is personally responsible for his own individual conduct. Man individualizes himself. Man's question is not, Is life immortal, but, Is *my* life immortal? Am I an immortal soul? This question implies two things: the possibility of man's immortality, and man's present uncertainty of it. Thought flows from the mind as water from a fountain; and as water cannot rise higher than its source, we cannot see how the thought of immortality could arise in a mind not possibly immortal. But if man had present certainty of his immortality, the question would be answered and silenced.

We find the genesis of this question, and also its answer implied, in the following facts of human consciousness and experience.

Man knows that he possesses powers of thought and action that are capable of indefinite expansion, and that these powers are never, in this life, developed to the full extent of their capacities. If physical death ends all, then man's life is never a finished existence. It is like a river that never reaches its ocean. Man, seeing that his life here below ends, if it ends in physical death, as an uncompleted thing, like a river in mid career

plunging over a precipice, is compelled to ask, Does the current of life continue to flow on in consciousness and development beyond the precipice of the death of the body? Man cannot bring himself to believe that God has created him with capacities and aspirations larger than the possibilities of the present life, and doomed his life always and forever to end as an incomplete and unfinished existence. Man's capacity for personal immortality is evidence that he has been created to be an immortal person. All other creatures on earth except man, the highest of all, have opportunity in this life to attain unto their highest possible development; it would seem, therefore, that man must have life beyond the grave in order that he might have opportunity to reach the fullness of his being.

But man not only thinks of immortality, he also desires it. This desire is an effect; and it must have a cause. This desire is universal. It is found in all sane minds, unless the fear of anticipated punishment for conscious crimes has smothered it; the cause of it, therefore, must be universal in human nature. Whatever is universal is natural and necessary. This universal

desire for immortality, springing from a universal aspiration that is natural to all men in their senses, infolds in itself the necessary inference that man is an immortal soul. If man is not immortal, his nature is fallacious and deludes him with false hopes. Can nature be false? Nature is the word of God. He spake and it was done.

Man's consciousness of a conscience infolds and implies in itself the necessity of the continued consciousness of his self-identity in a future existence. If we analyze our conscience, we find that it is not only the present director and censor of conduct, but also the accredited and recognized prophet of certain future retribution for present wrong-doing. Man's conscience tells him that his present and future well-being will follow, unfailingly, from right-doing, and that retributive punishment will inevitably overtake the wrong-doer. Man, under an awakened conscience, is conscious that death will not prevent or avert the just retribution of his crimes; therefore, he must conclude that death will not end his existence.

Man's conscience, his own ineradicable sense of right and wrong, tells him that God, the moral Sovereign of the universe, must be just and

righteous in the distribution of rewards and penalties to his moral creatures. But man looks around him in life and sees among men a manifest inequality in the consequences of the acts of this life: sometimes he sees that the guilty go unpunished and the innocent are punished; he sees the good in adversity and the wicked in prosperity; he sees falsehood prevailing over truth and crime triumphing over innocence. Man puts this fact of his observation together with the moral datum of his conscience, and the two constitute the major and minor premises of a syllogism from which the inevitable conclusion flows, that there must be a future life for both good and bad, in which the God of righteousness, in the distribution of his rewards and punishments, will equalize the manifest inequalities and rectify the crying injustices of this present life. If there is not a future life for all men in which these adjustments shall be made in the recompenses of a God of justice, then the universe is not under the reign of truth and righteousness, but is in moral anarchy.

When I said, in a former paragraph of this lecture, that physical life is not the harper but the

music of the harp, did you notice that it was life in a qualified sense of which this was said? There is life which is the harper that produces the music of concatenated thought and regulated action. It is psychical life, which is as much higher than physical life as physical life is higher than vegetable life. Here life, the living person, is the harper, and the psychical and physical natures of man are the double harp on which this harper plays. The strings of the harp of human life are the faculties of internal consciousness and external perception, and these strings all have their rise in the psychical nature of man, but are also attached to his physical organism; and through that attachment man comes into touch and communication with the physical world around him.

All life is not the same. The plant is a thing of life, the beast is a living thing, and man is a person that lives. Man lives in the consciousness of his self-directed thoughts and activities. The unconscious life of the vegetable is a harp without strings. It is dumb life. There is no music in it. The conscious life of beasts is a harp with strings, but without a harper to play upon them. It is an Æolian harp that gives

forth music only as its strings are moved by the winds of ever-changing circumstances blowing upon them. Before we can find the harper, playing upon a harp of a thousand strings, we must pass outside the range of the physical sciences and enter the domain of psychical existences. Here we find life in a psychical essence, a conscious person living and controlling the subordinate life of its physical organization, and giving self-direction to its own free activities. How do we know that there is such a life? We are conscious of it. This testimony of consciousness is the end of all controversy. I know that there is within my physical organization a psychical being—the life of conscious thought and free action which is my real self, living and doing. Neither plants nor beasts have this life in common with me. I know that I am more than a mere animal. Now, I may die as an animal, and yet live on as a man. I have a double life—a life in common with the beasts that perish, and a life that elevates me into a whole realm of existence above them. The continuance of the higher life may not be dependent upon the continued existence of the lower life. The higher life of

free intelligence and moral responsibility knows, on the dicta of its conscience, that it must stand in judgment before its God, and there answer for the deeds done while in its mortal existence. This is the life which constitutes man an immortal soul. This living person is the harper that strikes the strings of the harp of its life and brings forth the music of connected thought and regulated action. The strings of this harp, as we have already said, are, in this mortal existence, attached to a physical organization. When touched they give forth a double music—the music of a psychical and of a physical nature united. The double strains of this music are not always in harmony. The psychical and physical natures are not always attuned in accord with one another. For this reason the music of the double harp of human life is oftentimes jarring and discordant.

The physical organization of man's mortal life may be broken by violence, or may wear out in use. When this happens the strings of the harp of human life, which have their rise in man's psychical nature, are detached from his dead physical organization; but they still remain, well

strung and well tuned, in their indestructible connection with man's undying psychical organization. The harper, man the immortal soul, lives on and holds the harp of life in his hand, and henceforth, in a larger and nobler life, he draws forth from his imperishable harp a grander and sweeter music.

And now, lastly, it is a law of nature that nothing, neither force nor matter, can be absolutely destroyed. Force, when apparently exhausted, is only correlated into another form. This is known as the doctrine of the persistence of force. Matter, when apparently destroyed, has only been dissipated, to appear in some other forms. There can be no such thing as annihilation, except by the direct and miraculous power of the Great First Cause that called all things into existence. This law is universal, and is true of psychical essences and powers as well as of physical entities and forces. Mind cannot cease to exist, any more than matter can.

Now, matter must exist in space, and mind must exist in consciousness. Consciousness is the necessary condition of mental existence, as impenetrability is the necessary condition of ma-

terial existence. Mind without consciousness is unthinkable. It is like trying to think of matter existing without occupying space. Absolute unconsciousness in mind would be annihilation of mind. This is not a new doctrine, nor a doctrine that stands without the support of the very highest authority. Sir William Hamilton says: "Kant, that great thinker, distinctly maintains that we always dream when asleep; that to cease to dream would be to cease to live; and that those who fancy that they have not dreamt have only forgotten their dream." To this the great philosopher of common sense adds: "I have myself at different times turned my attention to this point, and, as far as my observations go, they certainly tend to prove that during sleep the mind is never either inactive or wholly unconscious of its activity. As to the objection of Locke and others, that, as we have no recollection of dreaming, we have therefore never dreamt, it is sufficient to say that the assumption in this argument—that consciousness and the recollection of it are convertible—is disproved in the most emphatic manner by experience." Sir William Hamilton has proved beyond a doubt that

even in the processes of our reasoning there may be latent consciousness. Sleep is a depression of external perception, but not a suppression of internal consciousness. If the mind was inwardly unconscious, how could it ever be aroused to wakefulness again? The physical impressions of sound and touch must be reported to a living consciousness within the sleeping man, or they could never awaken him to outward perception and activity. Consciousness in the man asleep at night is no more extinct than the life of the leafless tree in winter. Dr. George Moore, member of the Royal College of Physicians, says: "The most perfect impediment to the use of the body, short of death, is that of apoplectic sleep; but even in it we have reason to believe that the mind is often busy in dreaming. Some patients who appear perfectly apoplectic have remembered their dreams; and I have heard an individual, during a severe fit, continue to mutter earnestly about things in which he had been previously interested, and of which, on recovery, he had no recollection." From all this it is clear that well-known facts of experience attest that the mind is sometimes conscious when the body

is in profoundest sleep, and if sometimes, it may always be so. Experience does not show anything contrary to the doctrine that the mind is always and unceasingly conscious, and all its testimony goes to the establishment of the doctrine. We add to this that consciousness is the evidence of the existence of mind, and hence is the condition of mental existence. If there is sound reason in the axiom, I am conscious, therefore I am, it follows that the total absence of consciousness is proof of the non-existence of mind. But if it is a necessary conclusion from self-evident axioms of thought that consciousness is the condition of mental existence, how came it to pass that any philosophers have ever called the doctrine into question? The answer is that those philosophers, with Locke in the lead, have confounded recollection with consciousness. If we have never been conscious of anything except that which we recollect, then it would follow that we have not forgotten, and never can forget, anything. But we know that we have forgotten many things of which we were once fully conscious. We might be engaged in the contemplation of other properties of a physical object without having the attention turned to the fact that

it necessarily occupies space; and so we might study the powers of mind without having the thought directed to the fact that, if the mind exist at all, it must be conscious. But it seems clear, the moment that we think of it, that consciousness is to mind what extension is to matter. It follows, then, that absolute unconsciousness would be mental annihilation. But nothing is ever annihilated; therefore, mind is immortal. Immortality is as indestructible in mind as extension is in matter. You may grind matter into its ultimate and infinitesimal atoms, and then separate atom from atom, and yet each atom would occupy space. Just so, whatever disaster may fall upon the mind of man at death, or after death, it can never cease to be conscious.

We now add to this the doctrine of the ancients, which the moderns also hold because it is irrefutable, that the soul, the living person, is an uncompounded and indivisible essence; and then it will of necessity follow that man is a created and immortal person. Therefore all men, the good and the bad, are naturally immortal. The personal immortality of man is inherent in the uncompounded and indivisible nature of the psychical essence in which his true life inheres.

The conclusion of our philosophy is, that man is necessarily an immortal soul. It also follows that psychical life is totally different from physical life. In the mortal existence of man the two are connected in some mysterious way, but they are not identical; and consequently, physical death does not involve psychical death. There can be no psychical death. The psychical essence is essentially immortal. At physical death it is disengaged and disassociated from the physical system, and departs into the world of pure spirits. What are the conditions and activities of life in that world beyond the fact that it must be a life of uninterrupted and uninterruptible consciousness, we do not know, and we can never know, unless God speaks to us and reveals the secrets of the life that is to be. Neither science nor philosophy can ever discover those secrets. The psychical essence and the mode of its life are beyond the reach of the microscope or the telescope. The microscope by searching the brain cannot find the immortal soul, nor can the telescope by scanning the heavens ever discover the Eternal God. God the eternal Spirit, and man the immortal spirit, are not visible to the

physical eye, however it may be aided by magnifying-glasses. But notwithstanding the inability of the microscope to find the psychical essence of man within his physical system, yet man is positively conscious of his psychical life of self-directing thought and free will, and knows that he is a living and immortal mind; and notwithstanding the failure of the telescope to discover God enthroned in some one of the countless worlds that roll in space, yet man, the immortal person, knows, from the necessity of his own nature, and from the constitution of the world around him, that there is a living and eternal Mind upon the throne of the universe. If man with his physical eye, however aided, could see himself or his God, that would be proof that God is matter and not the eternal Mind, and that man is material and not immortal mind. I know that I am an immortal soul, because I am of an essence that can never die. I am a mind, and ceaseless consciousness is the condition of mental existence. Only the power that created me can destroy my consciousness, and that only by the act of absolute annihilation.

CHAPTER THIRD.

IS THE BIBLE A DIVINE REVELATION?

“The Bible professes to be a book from God, speaks everywhere with divine authority, and demands our submission. It is not A rule; it is THE rule both of practice and faith. To ascertain its meaning, we employ reason and the opinions of good men, and the experience of a devout heart; but no one of these helps, nor all combined, can be regarded as of coördinate authority. They are not parts of the law; they only help to expound it. To follow reason or opinions, or inward experience in matters of faith, when their decisions contradict the Bible, is to deny it: to follow them when they add to it, is to admit another revelation; and to make THEM our rule when they agree with it, is to rest our obedience on the wisdom of man, and not on the truth of God.”—JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D.

THE THIRD QUESTION.

IS THE BIBLE A DIVINE REVELATION?

WHATEVER new truth a man learns as the result of his own observation and research is of the nature of a discovery. When one person communicates to others truths which they did not previously know, his communication to them is a revelation. The two acts are similar, but not identical. In the first, the man in gaining his new knowledge is active, but in the second he is passive. In the first, he finds out something which he did not know before; he makes a discovery. In the second, another person tells him something which, likewise, he did not know before; he receives a revelation. A man who makes a discovery may at once become a revealer, by communicating his discovery to others. Sir Isaac Newton made a discovery when he thought out the cause why the apple fell from the tree; he made a revelation to others when he proclaimed

and expounded that cause as a law of nature. A discoverer lifts a covering and finds what was under it; a revealer lifts a veil and shows to others what was behind it.

Applying these definitions to the Bible, the question arises, Did the sacred writers by their own thought and study reason out and thus discover the truths which they have recorded? If so, then the Bible is nothing more than a human revelation, containing only a record of human discoveries; and, consequently, it has no higher authority than that of human thought and reason. But if the Bible is a record of a system of truths and doctrines which the sacred writers did not discover as the result of their own observation and reason, but which was communicated to them by the Spirit of the living God, then it is a divine revelation, and, as such, has divine authority over the thoughts and actions of men. If the Bible is a revelation from God to men, given through men to whom God revealed himself, then it is God's Word inspired in men's words. A divine revelation is a communication from the divine Mind to the human mind of a knowledge of divine truths which the human

mind, by the ordinary exercise of its powers of observation and reason, could never have discovered.

We open the Bible and find that it contains a great mass of matter that is purely historical and biographical, and which could have been discovered by human observation and inquiry; and in many places the record itself implies that the sacred writers did learn many of the facts by their own observation, and from various sources of human information. Is the presence of such matter in the Bible incompatible with the hypothesis that, taken as a whole, it is a divine revelation? We think not. It may be that such facts are recited in order that the divine truths infolded in them might be brought out and revealed unto men. In revealing the law of gravitation the fact that an apple fell from a tree to the ground is mentioned not that men might know that an apple had thus fallen, but that men might be enabled to understand the law of nature that made the apple fall. Just so many events of human history are recorded in the volume of divine inspiration not that they might be known as human history pure and simple, but that the

presence and purpose of a divine government concealed in human history might be unveiled and revealed to men. The Bible is not meant to be a history of the origin and development of the human race, nor of a particular family of the human race and of its development into a chosen nation, but is meant to be a revelation of God's moral relations to the race and of his purpose in all human events.

In order that God's presence in a moral government over men, and the grand purpose of that government, might be revealed, it was necessary that the volume of divine revelation should contain a recital of certain grand facts of human history and of certain minute facts of the personal history of certain individuals. Therefore, the fact that the Bible contains a recital of many historical and biographical events is not incompatible with the hypothesis that it is, from beginning to end, a divine revelation, revealing the presence and purpose of God as a moral Sovereign in all human events, great and small. The divine revelation does not consist in the recital of the human events which the sacred writers might have known, and many of which no doubt they did

know, as the result of human observation and reason, but in the unfolding of the divine purpose involved in and underlying them—a fact which the human reason, unenlightened by the divine Spirit, could never have discovered. The presence and power of God as Creator and Preserver are manifested in his works, but the intentions and purposes of God as the moral Governor and Redeemer of the human race can be known only as they are revealed in the declarations of his Word.

In the same way men reveal themselves to one another in their works and by their words. A man's moral intentions and purposes in life, and the motives that shape and control his conduct, may be inferred from his works, but can never be fully and certainly known unless they be also declared in words. When a man declares what the purpose of his life is, and unfolds the plan on which he is working out that purpose, then thereafter his works are to be interpreted in the light of his words. The verbal revelation is to be thrown back over his past life, and the intention and purpose of all his actions are to be read in its light. If that revelation is found to be in ac-

cord with the logical trend of his conduct, its truth is thereby confirmed, and his conduct, in points where it could not before be understood, is also thereby explained. When a man has once declared the plan and purpose of his life, we have henceforth of that man a double revelation—an unavoidable revelation made by his works and a voluntary and explanatory revelation given in his words.

The verbal revelation may be made to a chosen few, and by them be imparted to others, either verbally or in writing, or in both forms. When a man thus reveals himself to others we have a human revelation of the plan and purpose of a human life.

An earthly sovereign, a president, or a governor may thus reveal the plan and purpose of his administration to his subjects. When such a revelation is made it is usually imparted to chosen ministers, and by them declared to others whom it may concern. In such declarations there may be the recital of many events of a historical nature which were well known as facts before the revealer declared them; but it may have been necessary to repeat them in unfolding the

plan and in explaining the purpose of the government and the mode of its administration. In such a revelation it may also be necessary to announce beforehand future works embraced in the plan and purpose of the revealer.

A governor may have good reasons for making such a revelation of the plan and purpose of his government to his own citizens, or at least to a portion of them, so that those for whose good he is working might coöperate with him in the execution of his plans. He might also have good reasons for making only a partial revelation of his plan and purpose, and that only to a select few; for, if his intentions were all known, or were known to all, enemies and opponents might hinder his work, or even defeat his purpose.

Now, has God, as the Sovereign of the universe, made such a revelation of himself to man? If the Bible is a book in which the plan and purpose of God's moral government over men is unfolded, then it is a divine revelation; and if it is a divine revelation, it is God's Word spoken unto men.

Can God thus speak unto men, as one person speaks unto other persons?

We have found that God is the self-existent and eternal Person, and that man is a created and immortal person. There is, then, a plurality of persons.

When two persons meet they are capable of communication with one another. Persons can exchange their thoughts. When beasts meet they make mutual impressions upon one another. Man can, to a limited extent, convey the impressions of his thoughts to beasts, and can, from their expressions and motions, infer to some extent the impressions that are influencing them. But a real conversation between men and beasts is not possible. Conversation implies that discourse of reason which belongs only to free intelligences. A person is a free intelligence—one that thinks and directs his life by his thoughts.

The intercommunication of free intelligences does not depend upon a language of words. Oral language is the outgrowth of personal intercommunication. It is an advanced mode by which persons communicate their thoughts to one another. Written language is a still more advanced mode of personal intercommunication. It is the mode of communicating thoughts to

those not present to hear the voice of speech. Two persons who have not a single word of language in common may exchange their thoughts by signs. When two foreigners meet who have not one word of language in common, it is not like the meeting of two beasts, nor of a man and a beast.

Now, as God is the eternal Person and man is a created person, and as the power of intercommunication is a condition of personal existence, it follows that there can be an intercommunication of thoughts between God and man. God can speak to man, and man can comprehend his voice. There may be physical and metaphysical difficulties in the way of our clear comprehension of the mode of intercommunication between the infinite Mind and our finite minds, but we know that God can speak to men because he is a Person and men are persons. It is not incumbent upon us to show how the Infinite communicates with the finite; if we show the fact that there is communication between us and our God, that will be the end of the controversy. That there is such intercommunication between God and man is implied in every class of evidence that

proves that there is a God, and that man is a person capable of knowing himself, and of knowing that he is a responsible creature, bound to reverence and obey the God that made him.

God has spoken to man in external nature. He has written his thoughts upon the works of his hands, and revealed himself in the laws of nature. In the external works of nature thought and forethought are everywhere obvious; in internal consciousness the personal intelligence of the Creator is revealed to man's intellect; and, above all, in his conscience man knows himself to be the lawful subject of his Creator, who reigns over him as the moral Sovereign of his life. As God has spoken to man in all these ways, who will say that he cannot speak to him in words, as man speaks to man? He gave man his power of speech; then, are we to say that he cannot speak to the speaker whom he has made?

But man needs to know more of his God and of himself than he can learn from himself and the external world around him. Man, in his present condition, is conscious that his knowledge of God and of his own duty and destiny is imperfect and insufficient. His conscience tells him that he is

under a moral law which he has violated. Man knows in his conscience that in the sight of his moral Sovereign he is a sinner. This consciousness of sin is as universal as the race. Man knows that he has fallen from his true place in relation to his God. His conscience tells him this, but his reason fails to inform him how he came to fall away from his God, or how he can be restored to his favor. There is no voice in nature that speaks of mercy. Conscience says, Sin must be punished. There is no light in nature that reveals to man, conscious of sin and guilt, a possible way of restoration to the favor of God, whose moral law he knows he has violated. If God does not speak to man in a new revelation, showing a way of forgiveness and salvation, then man is shut up, in the misery of his sin, to endless despair. Will God speak to man, and show him a way of salvation? We cannot say in advance what God will do; but we ask, Has God thus spoken to man? This is our question.

Now, here is a Book "which claims God for its author, truth for its contents, and salvation for its end." This Book claims to be the Word of God inspired in the words of men. It claims

to reveal to man how he came to be a sinner, and to unfold to him the divine provision for his redemption from sin. It claims to reveal the divine plan for man's salvation through the atonement of Jesus Christ our Lord. We call this book the Bible—the Book. This Book is written in human language, but it claims to be the Word of God breathed into the words of men. We find in it such declarations as these: “Hear ye the Word of the Lord; Thus saith the Lord; The Word of the Lord came unto me saying.” From such expressions it is evident that the writers of this Book claimed that they were inspired to write what they wrote; that is, that the Word of God is inspired in their words. This claim must be wholly true or wholly false. There can be no middle ground. It is like a banknote, wholly genuine or wholly counterfeit. This Bible is either God's truth or man's lie. It cannot be half one and half the other. This is the issue concerning this Book. It is placed on trial, not for alleged errors, slight or grave, but for its very existence. If its high claim cannot be fully established, it must be given up *in toto*. The Bible is on trial for its life.

We believe that the Bible is what it claims to be, first, because, if true, it fills a place in man's life which his conscious necessities demand should be filled, and which no other known work can fill. Man is just as conscious of his sinful condition as he is of his existence. The Bible alone tells him how he came to be a sinner, and unfolds a divine plan of mercy and salvation for sinful men. This is what man needs, above all things, to know, and what is nowhere else discoverable. This creates a strong presumption in favor of its genuineness and truth. It fills a conscious void in man's life, and solves a problem for which no other solution can be found. When we have a bolted lock, and one furnishes us a key that fits into it and turns back the bolts, we conclude at once that we have the right key for that lock. If no other key can be found that fits that lock, and no other lock which that key fits, then we conclude that we have the very key that was made for that lock. The Bible fits into the moral necessities of man's life, and explains their mysteries, which, otherwise, are inexplicable. It must be a book given for this very purpose.

If the Bible, which so admirably explains the great mystery of human life, is not what it claims to be, the Word of God inspired in the words of men, then it is wholly a human fabrication. If it is the fabrication of men, it must be either the work of good men who mistakenly thought that they were inspired of God to write what they wrote, or the conscious and willful fraud of men who knowingly palmed off on men, as God's Word, what they knew at the time were only their own unauthorized words. Can either of these hypotheses be sustained? We think not.

We must remember that the Bible is not one book, but a library of books written by different men—men very unlike one another, living at great intervals of time from one another during a period of more than fifteen hundred years—and that there were more than thirty of these writers. When we remember these facts, it is simply impossible for us to believe that the sixty-six books of the Bible were thus composed by sincere men who were deluded enthusiasts and dreamers. It might be possible for one man, or even for one set of men associated together under a passing wave of enthusiasm, to imagine that God was

speaking in their words when he was not; but it is impossible for us to imagine that the more than thirty human authors of the Bible, so widely separated from one another in time, and so different from each other in character and station in life, could possibly have been the dupes of their own imaginations. It is still more impossible for us to believe that our Bible is the conscious fraud of conscienceless hypocrites. It might be possible for one set of men, working together, to fabricate and palm off on mankind a great literary fraud; but it is impossible for us to imagine that one set of men after another should take up the same fraud, knowing it to be a fraud, and perpetuate it from one generation to another.

We must add to this that the Bible, from beginning to end, inculcates the moral obligation of truth and sincerity, and that the authors of our sacred books lived lives of great self-denial, and some of them died in martyrdom, in attestation of the truth of what they taught. It is just simply impossible to believe that they were wicked men, hypocrites and deceivers. Such persons as Moses, Paul, and Jesus were not self-deluded enthusiasts, nor conscious hypocrites, trying to de-

ceive others. The reason can more readily believe everything in the Bible in the most literal and realistic sense of the words, than believe that the human authors of its various books were either self-deceived enthusiasts or hypocrites trying to deceive others.

Then, can we suppose that our sacred books were written by men who never intended that they should be interpreted in a literal sense, but should be read as fables and fairy stories, originally intended to teach great moral lessons? This hypothesis is confronted at the start by two insurmountable obstacles; the writers themselves claimed that the Lord spoke through them, and that they recorded facts and not fancies, and that, too, under the infallible guidance of a divine inspiration. We cannot avoid the alternatives, the Bible is what it claims to be, the Word of God inspired in the words of men, or it is the production of devout enthusiasts who were self-deluded, or it is the forgery of designing men who sought to deceive mankind. We have seen that neither of the latter views is tenable. We cannot account for the existence of the Bible on any other reasonable hypothesis than that it is a divine revela-

tion from God to men, the Word of God written in the words of men.

We have not alluded to the mythical hypothesis of Strauss nor to Renan's legendary theory, because they are now dead, having been thrust through and through by the keen blade of modern scholarship. We now know, for a certainty, that the Epistles of St. Paul were in circulation in the year 60 A.D., less than thirty years after the cruel death of the divine Founder of Christianity. It is impossible to suppose that the story of our gospel in that short time could have grown up as a myth or a legend. Strauss lived to be present at the funeral of his mythical hypothesis, and exclaimed in bitter disappointment, "Criticism has run all to leaves." Of his theory there is nothing now left but a handful of dead leaves. Long before Renan died Professor Dornier said of Renan's "Life of Jesus," "*Das ist Nichts*" ("That is nothing"). The mythical and legendary theories of Strauss and Renan have no longer any influence except with a few belated inquirers who walk at least twenty-five years behind the progress of real scholarship. The criticism of the present day does not count

them in the field as living antagonists to Christianity. They are refuted and dead issues.

The attention of scholars is just now engaged with what is known as the "higher criticism." This term is very indefinite, and covers a very widespreading ramification of topics. The terms "higher" and "lower" as defining criticism may refer to the methods of criticism or to the objects criticised. In the old definition of the term, "lower criticism" had reference to the genuineness or spuriousness of single words or letters, and the "higher criticism" had reference to the genuineness or spuriousness of whole sentences, paragraphs, or chapters. And as defined by methods, the "lower criticism" determines the question of genuineness by external historical evidence, and the "higher criticism" by internal evidence, such as "the language, style of composition, archæological and historical traces, the conception of the author respecting the various subjects of human thought, and the like." Therefore, the questions of the "higher criticism" open such a wide field of inquiry, a field in which the pathways of research are so multitudinous in their various ramifications that it is ut-

terly impossible for us to enter it in this course of lectures. To be satisfactorily handled, it must have a course of lectures all to itself.

The higher criticism does not deny that the Bible is the Word of God in the words of men, but undertakes to say that certain paragraphs in various books of the sacred volume as we now possess it do not belong to the Book as a part of the original divine revelation; and hence, that the Bible, at least as we now have it, is not inerrant. It also undertakes to say that certain ones of our sacred books, or that certain portions of some of them, were not written by the persons whose names are now attached to them as their authors, and hence there are errors in our present Bible that have crept in through the ignorance and imperfections of the men who collected and edited the various books as we now have them. These errors are to be detected and expugned by human criticism.

This theory of speculative scholarship should not disturb our faith in the inerrant validity of God's Word, because it is now found to be a web of linguistic speculation, woven of fine threads of brilliant fancies that are continually

breaking at the touch of historical facts that the pen of true scholarship and the spade of exploration are constantly bringing to light. These higher critics are sometimes discomfited by an external historical fact springing up suddenly and upsetting their finespun theories—reminding one of the story of the ornithologist who stood before the window of a curiosity shop, criticising the fancied malformation of what he supposed to be a stuffed owl, when, in the midst of his criticism, while he was ridiculing the unskillfulness of the taxidermist, the owl, solemnly lifting up its head, hooted at him, “Who! who! who are you?” Let one illustration suffice. Luke, in Acts 13:7, speaks of Sergius Paulus as “proconsul” of Cyprus. If Cyprus was at the time of Paul’s visit to that island an imperial province and not a senatorial district, the title of the governor should be “proprætor” and not “proconsul.” Now both Strabo and Dion Cassius say Cyprus was an imperial province, and therefore, said the critics, Luke was in error as to the proper title of Sergius Paulus. This criticism prevailed and had its influence for a number of years. But now it turns out, on the fur-

ther testimony of Dion Cassius himself, that the Emperor Augustus did hold Cyprus for a while as an imperial province, but that afterward it was made a senatorial district, and that it was such at the time of Paul's visit; and so the proper official title of the governor was at the time "proconsul," as Luke gives it, and not "proprætor," as the learned critics contended it should have been. And confirming the absolute historical accuracy of Luke, coins have been found on the island on which its rulers are called "proconsuls," and one of them, found by General Cesnola, bears the inscription, "in the proconsulship of Paulus." Thus, not only in this case, but in a multitude of other cases, recent discoveries in Bible-lands have thrown the so-called higher critics into discomfiture and disgrace. We are even now justified in claiming that the Bible fits into the Bible-lands, historically, geographically, and topographically, just as a peculiar picture fits into its own peculiar frame in which no other picture can be made to fit.

God has given us two great volumes of revelation—his Word and his Works. Both of these books are addressed to the reason, and both re-

quire thought and study in order to discover their deep meaning. In neither are the facts of the revelation separated and classified. The facts belonging to different departments of thought are intermixed and commingled. The facts of geology, botany, zoology, and so on, are commingled and scattered over the whole face of the earth. So in the Written Word the facts of creation, of sin, of redemption, of faith, of repentance, and so on through all the departments of religious thought, are scattered and commingled throughout all the books. The revelations of theology are not given in systems written out in separate books and chapters. Man must discriminate, separate, and classify, and thus form his own systems of doctrines and duties. God reveals himself in both of the great books in the same manner and order, but there are revelations in each volume not contained in the other. The Word and Works of God are not two editions of the same volume, but are one book in two volumes. The contents of the volumes are for the most part different, but in no part contradictory. They are not identical, but are complementary to one another. The harmony of the two great

volumes consists, not in the sameness of their contents, but in the absence of discord and disagreement. Between the Bible and science there is no appearance of contradiction except in points held in controversy on one side or the other, or on both sides. Where the facts of Scripture and the facts of science are both clearly apprehended and understood there is perfect harmony, or, what amounts to the same thing, total absence of disharmony. Their fields lie apart, touching only at given points. Where they touch they harmonize, and in their separation there is no disharmony. The Works are for the most part a revelation of material things, and the Word is a revelation of spiritual truths.

The Bible is a revelation from God to man, principally teaching him the things necessary for him to know which he cannot learn from the light of nature. It is given in the words of men, and is addressed to the reason. It reveals truths which man could not reason out, but which, on their presentation, his reason apprehends and approves. In this respect it is different from all other books. It is an inspired book; not in the sense in which the poems of Shakespeare, Milton,

and Homer are inspired, but in a far more exalted sense. In poetic inspiration the loftiest flight of a man's own thoughts are caught and enchained in words. The inspiration of Scripture is of a different nature entirely from this. The sacred writers were not lifted up into an exaltation of human thought, but the thoughts of God were inspired—breathed into their words. There may have been an exaltation of human thought, but that was not the divine inspiration that makes what they wrote the Word of God in the words of men. It is not essential that we should understand the mode of inspiration. Somehow, God communicated his Word—the divine thought—to certain chosen men, so that they received it with infallible certainty, and recorded it with infallible accuracy. But it was the men and not their pens that were inspired. There is therefore a human element, as well as a divine element, in every sentence and word of Holy Writ. The individual and personal characteristics of the different inspired writers are discernible, and can be traced in their respective writings. The Bible, then, is the Word of God inspired—inbreathed—in the words of men. To

compare great things with small, as Milton so often says, we can get an illustration of divine inspiration from those writings of Plato in which he claims to give the thoughts of Socrates in his own words, claiming that Socrates was speaking through him. If the *Phaedo* and the *Phaedrus* are indeed what they claim to be, they were inspired in the mind of Plato by the mind of Socrates. They contain the word of Socrates in the words of Plato. In this way, but in a more perfect degree, the divine Mind inspired the human minds of Moses, Matthew, Paul, and all the other prophets, evangelists, and apostles, so that God's Word is breathed into their human words. In the Written Word the divine thought and human thought are united in one expression, just as in the Incarnate Word the divine nature and the human nature are united in one person. The two are distinct, but inseparable. The question of the inerrancy of the Written Word is the same as that of the impeccability of the Incarnate Word. The divine nature of Jesus the Christ is absolutely impeccable, and his human nature was made impeccable by its union with the divine; so the Word of God is absolutely inerrant, and

the human words in which it was inbreathed were made inerrant by the divine inspiration. The human words in which the divine Word is inspired are the finite and translatable element. There could be no error in the original words. In their meaning when selected, and as used by the inspired penmen, they expressed the divine thought with absolute precision and accuracy, as far as it is possible for divine ideas to be expressed in human symbols. This leaves no room for error as to facts or doctrines, but the human words may have been inadequate to express the fullness of the divine thought. There is absolute inerrancy in the truth taught, though there may be inadequacy in the human utterance in which it is expressed. St. Paul seems to have been conscious of the inadequacy of human words to contain the divine Word, and hence he sometimes used double superlatives. When caught up into heaven he heard divine words absolutely unutterable in human words. Then, again, the divine Word, inspired in human words, has power to expand and enlarge their meaning. The divine Logos, incarnated in the human nature of the Man Christ Jesus, expanded and uplifted his

manhood beyond all possible development of any mere human life. We have said the human words in which the divine Word is inspired is a finite element, and that it is translatable and transmissible. The Bible is the most translatable book in human language. In the transcriptions and translations of uninspired men errors may have crept in. Such errors are to be sought out by critical research, comparing Scripture with Scripture and with all other known and unquestioned and unquestionable truths. Here is a field for human criticism, but it must confine itself to the inquiries, What constitutes the divine Word? and, What do the human words in which it is inspired mean in the sense belonging to them when they were divinely selected? Beyond these limits biblical criticism has no field. But this is a wide field. Let it be devoutly, humbly, and fearlessly cultivated. We will not shun criticism. We are not bibliolaters. We do not worship the Bible, but the God of the Bible, who has given us his Word in our words to teach us how to worship him in the right way.

The Bible is not the source of our religion,

but is an inspired record of the great truths of our religion as revealed from God to men, and of the experiences of those persons and peoples into whose lives these divine truths have penetrated. Religion came first, and the Bible followed. It did not, as a written record, all come at one time; it has been given at different times, through different men, who lived at long intervals from one another during a period of more than fifteen hundred years. It is the outgrowth of religion; but, manifestly, from its harmony and unity from beginning to end, it is all one stream of thought, flowing out of one and the same fountain of divine thought. It is the Word of the one only living God breathed into the words of many different men.

Now, here is a Book composed of sixty-six different books, written by more than thirty different authors, a book that was written at different intervals through a period of more than fifteen hundred years, and there is in it a consistency of contents, a harmony of thought, and a unity of purpose, marvelous to consider, which unify all the parts and divisions of this Book of books so that it stands forth, connected and com-

pleted, as the production of one mind, consistent and concordant from beginning to end. Can this Book, which claims to be the Word of God in the words of men, be anything else than what it claims to be? Suppose that thirty odd men bearing blocks of marble with a disconnected letter inscribed upon each of them, in all sixty-six pieces, unequally distributed among them, should come into this hall, not together but one after another, and at unequal intervals, and that the first should lay down the blocks he brings in a certain order and go out, and the second should lay his piece or pieces in a certain order on those he found and go out, and so on until the last one appeared and placed his block in its place; and that then we should look at the pile of marble blocks and find that they formed a perfect cross with the likeness of the Son of Man hanging on it, and that the letters on the sixty-six blocks combined and composed the sentence, "Death came into the world by sin, but life through the Man Christ Jesus crucified." Now, suppose that I should tell you that those thirty odd men had acted independently of each other, that neither knew what the others were doing, and that each

had shaped his own marble blocks, and inscribed upon each the letter that his own unprompted fancy had suggested, and that the cross and the form on it, and the sentence which the combined letters composed, had all resulted from chance, without a comparison of thought or a conspiracy of purpose;—would you believe me? Could you believe me? You could not. You would be obliged to say, Such a thing is impossible. But suppose I should tell you, and the thirty odd men should confirm my word, that those men had indeed acted independently of each other, but that they had, each separately, acted under the control and direction of my thought; that I had sent to each one in his own distant home the exact pattern of the block or blocks of marble I desired him to prepare, and of the letter to be inscribed on each block; and that they had brought the blocks in the time and order which I had prescribed, and laid them upon one another as I had directed; and that they had done all this, each doing his own part without knowing what the others had done or were to do; and that the result was not the outcome of their disconnected thoughts and disjointed works, but

was the result of my own mind, unifying and controlling the works of thirty odd men so as to work out the purpose formed in my own mind, and never fully explained to any one of the workmen. You could understand that. You could believe it. It is a reasonable explanation. You would then say, That cross with its image and its inscription is the work of one mind expressed in the works of many minds, all unified in the expression of one purpose. No other imaginable explanation could be received as rational and satisfactory. That is just what our Bible is—the Word of God inspired in the words of many men. It is one Book composed of sixty-six different books, written by thirty odd different writers; and when all the books of this Book are combined into one, we have erected before us the Cross of Calvary and the Saviour of the world dying on it; and in the divine record, a revelation of man's sin and fall, and of his redemption and salvation through Jesus Christ the crucified. Is this the work of men, scheming not together, but working independently of each other, at long intervals apart, for a period of more than fifteen hundred years? Impossible!

It is the work of one Mind, directing and guiding all the minds which worked out the divine plan. This Book of books, thus written, is what it claims to be, the Word of God inspired in the words of men, revealing how man came to be a sinner, and that Jesus Christ is his only but all-sufficient Saviour. "Whosoever believeth in him shall be saved."

CHAPTER FOURTH.
IS CHRIST A LIVING SAVIOUR?

“It ought to be placed in the forefront of all Christian teaching that Christ’s mission to earth was to give men Life. ‘I am come,’ he said, ‘that ye might have Life, and that ye might have it more abundantly.’ And that he meant literal Life, literal, spiritual, and eternal Life, is clear from the whole course of his teaching and acting. To impose a metaphorical meaning on the commonest word of the New Testament is to violate every canon of interpretation, and at the same time to charge the greatest of teachers with persistently mystifying his hearers with the unusual use of an exact word, and that on the most momentous subject of which he ever spoke to men.”—PROFESSOR HENRY DRUMMOND.

THE FOURTH QUESTION.

IS CHRIST A LIVING SAVIOUR?

CHRISTIANITY is the religion that is revealed and unfolded in the Bible. If the Bible is a divine revelation, as we have seen that it is, then Jesus of Nazareth, the founder of Christianity, was more than a great moral teacher like Socrates or Zeno: he was God's Eternal Son, come down from the skies not to open a new school among men, but to establish a kingdom—the kingdom of heaven on earth. Christ is greater than Moses not because he was a deeper thinker, or a more logical reasoner, or a wiser reformer, who hit upon a plan better adapted for civilizing the world, but because he appeared among men as a divine Saviour, come down from heaven to earth, not for the temporal civilization of men, but for their eternal salvation. Christ Jesus came into the world not only to teach ignorant men and to give light to darkened minds, but also to save lost

men, to give life to dead souls. He must not only show the truth, but must also give new eyes to see the truth. The darkness that covers the souls of men is not that darkness that is caused by the absence of light, but the darkness that is caused by the want of eyes to see in the light. The light shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not. Jesus came to give life, and thus to open the eyes of the dead. In him was life, and the life was the light of men. The life in Christ is not derived and dependent life; in him is the fountain of self-existent and self-subsisting life. He came into the world as a living Saviour that men might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

Only the lost can be saved. In what respect is man a lost creature? He is in the world. He is in possession of natural senses. He thinks, he feels, he reasons, and he acts. He is physically and mentally alive. Yet he is a lost being. What has he lost? He has lost his spiritual life. He is spiritually dead. Christ came into the world as the Saviour of men, to restore to them that spiritual life which the race once possessed, but which has been lost in the sin and fall of the

race. He came as our Saviour not merely to restore this life, but also to develop in men a larger and fuller measure of it than that which man had originally possessed. Hence, Christ came into the world not merely as a great moral teacher and reformer, but as the divine Life-Restorer—the Saviour who saves men by restoring spiritual life to their spiritually dead souls. The impartation of this spiritual life to the dead soul is called a second birth. Ye must be born *again*. The soul must be born *again* into the spiritual life which the race once possessed, but which by sin has been lost. This new life is a birth, not from the womb of eternity, but from the tomb of time. It is the soul's resurrection from the grave of sin, and its restoration to the life of holiness. To do this great work the world must have a forever living Saviour—not merely a Saviour that once lived on earth, but a Saviour that now lives, and has lived forever, by virtue of life inherent and indestructible in himself. Such a Saviour human philosophy cannot find. But the Bible, which, we have seen, is a divine revelation, reveals to us Jesus Christ as the living Saviour of the dead world. This great fact is the soul of the Bible,

and all else contained in it is the body incorporating this soul. Take Christ out of the Bible and what would be left would be a dead book. Its histories, prophecies, laws, doctrines, and devotions all relate to a personal Redeemer, and are all explanatory, directly or indirectly, of his divine mission and work on earth for the redemption of man from the death of sin. The Bible is the literature of the Jewish nation, containing its history, its laws, its forms of worship, its doctrines, its devotions, its poetry, its romances, its rhapsodies, and an account of its relations to surrounding nations; but Jesus Christ, the Messiah of the Jews and the Saviour of the world, is the great personal outcome of the Jewish nation. He is, therefore, the hero of the book of Jewish literature, the center to which the Old Testament converges and from which the New Testament emerges. Christianity is the outcome of Judaism—is Judaism stripped of its conventional ceremonies and national limitations. The history of Judaism is the beginning of the history of Christianity. The Bible is entirely and exclusively a Jewish book. There is not a single line in it, not even in the New Testament, that was not written

by a Jew. While I say this, I am well aware that some able writers hold that Luke was a Gentile, basing their opinion on Col. 4 : 11, 14. But there is no evidence that the Luke there mentioned as "the beloved physician" was the same Luke who wrote the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles; and even if he was, the passage does not exclude him from those of the circumcision any more than it does from those who were "fellow-workers" with Paul "unto the kingdom of God." If Luke had been a Gentile, surely some more definite intimation of the fact would have fallen out in his own writings or in the Epistles of Paul. He was one of the earliest converts, and it seems almost certain that, if he had been a Gentile, the fact would have been explicitly stated. Jesus, who is the soul of the Bible, was a Jew. Salvation is of the Jews, but it is for the world. The Messiah of the Jews is the Saviour of the world.

But the Jews as a separate people did not come into existence for more than two thousand years after the fall of man; and we cannot suppose that the world during all that period was without a knowledge of its Saviour. On

the contrary, we are informed that the Saviour was revealed and promised to fallen man at the very gate of Eden. It was said to Adam and Eve, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent." They were not driven out from Eden without hope. Christ, as sinful man's Saviour from the death of his sin, was revealed to them. That revelation was not gradual and progressive, but was full and all-sufficient at the beginning. God revealed the object of faith and the way of salvation and the mode of worship to the fallen race when yet it was an unmultiplied family. It was when families were multiplied and scattered that the knowledge of a Redeemer became darkened in the minds of men. When the race was reduced by the Flood to one family, the knowledge of Christ as the Redeemer of men was again universal. But again, as families multiplied and spread, the knowledge of the divine revelation became darkened and perverted in the minds of men. All this happened centuries before the first line of the Bible was written. In the midst of this widespread darkness, and all but universal forgetfulness of the promised Redeemer, God called Abraham and entered

into a peculiar covenant with him, separating him and his descendants from the rest of the world, and promising that of them should be born the promised Seed in whom all the families of earth should be blessed. This was the beginning of the peculiar people which developed into the Jewish nation.

From Abraham to Moses, the writer of the first and oldest books of the Bible, was a period of nearly five hundred years. There may have been, as some critics contend, some short records before the days of Moses, which he used, under divine direction, in composing the Pentateuch; but be that as it may, we are safe in saying that the Bible begins with the writings of Moses, at least twenty-five hundred years after the fall of man. We cannot believe that man was left without a knowledge of the way of life for so many centuries after the great event in which is grounded his need of the revelation of a Saviour to redeem him from the death of sin; and hence, we must conclude that the revelation of Christ, and of the way of salvation through him, did not originally spring from the Bible, but that it was made known in the world thousands of years before the first word of the Bible was written.

The Word of God in the words of men was handed down in oral traditions from fathers to their sons through all the generations from Adam to Moses. Evident traces of these traditions are found in all the ancient religions of the Oriental non-Bible lands. Our religion is not the outcome of the Bible, but the Bible is the outcome of our religion. Religion came first, and the Bible came afterward. In the Bible we have the inspired record of the divine revelation of the true religion, but the revelation itself was in the world and was known among men long centuries before the first syllable of it was recorded in writing.

I know that this view militates against a favorite theory held by certain critics, that the divine revelation of Christ Jesus, as the Messiah of the Jews and as the Saviour of the world, was progressively and gradually imparted to the race. This theory is a gratuitous assumption which is not supported by Scripture nor founded on reason. It is not reasonable to suppose that the God of absolute justice, to say nothing of his mercy, would leave the human race for thousands of years to perish in total ignorance of the divine way of salvation. The Scriptures inform us that

in fact he did not, for before driving the guilty pair from Paradise he revealed unto them the divine plan of redemption through the Seed of the woman, who should bruise the head of the serpent, and thereby redeem the race from eternal death. There is no reason to believe that this revelation was not full and complete at the beginning, and from the beginning down through all the ages. On the contrary, from the necessity of the case, there is every reason to believe that the divine plan of man's salvation, in all its essential details, was made known at the gate of Eden, and that it was clearly understood by the antediluvians, and by Noah, by Abraham, by Isaac and Jacob, and by all the Israelites before the days of Moses; and perhaps it was also more or less clearly understood by many other tribes. Balaam was not an Israelite, and yet the God of Israel spake to him. He may have spoken to other non-Israelite teachers.

It was not necessary for Moses, whose writings date at least twenty-five hundred years after the Fall, to have done more than to make bare mention of the fact that those who lived prior to his day were not left in ignorance as to the way of

life. He wrote for his contemporaries and for future generations, and recorded the facts pertaining to man's salvation which are to be conserved in Holy Writ to the end of time for all men's instruction.

The Bible was not given to prove that there is a God, or that man is an immortal person. These are the two fundamental facts that are assumed in it as the basis on which religion becomes possible and a revelation needful. They are taken for granted as known and admitted by all; and, as the underlying doctrines, they run through the Bible from beginning to end, permeating and vivifying every part and particle. When Moses wrote there was no need of even so much as stating these doctrines, because everybody believed them. The immortality of the soul was the universal doctrine of the Oriental religions at the time of the Exodus, and for long generations afterward. Not atheism, but polytheism, was the great error that Moses and the other writers of the first books of the Bible had to confront. The great questions which they had to answer were, not, *Au sit Deus?* but, *Quid sit Deus?* and, *Qualis sit Deus?* The keynote in the early his-

tory of Israel was, "Thy God is one, the eternal Person who alone is the Creator and moral Sovereign of the universe." It was only in the later ages, when fools began to say in their hearts, "There is no God," that men began to have doubts about the immortality of their souls. Before Jesus came the darkness of Jewish Sadduceism and of Pagan atheism had come down upon the world; and he came when this darkness had reached its midnight blackness; and then he brought life and immortality to light, saying, as he stood at the mouth of the opened tomb from which the dead, in response to his almighty word, was rising to life again, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live again; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." Thus he brought life and immortality to light, declaring that immortal life is more than immortal existence. It is spiritual life arising out of spiritual death through faith in him, in whom there is the life that is the light of men. The Bible, from beginning to end, is the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ as the living Saviour of the dead world; and Christ, when thus revealed, brings

life and immortality, immortal life, to light. This is the gospel of our salvation. It does not begin with Matthew, but with Genesis, and it runs through the whole Bible to the last word. Its first word is, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" and its last word is, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." At the beginning God is on the throne of his power as Creator, and at the end he is on the throne of his grace as Redeemer. This shows that some tremendous change has taken place in the relations between God and man. The Bible alone explains what this change is, and when and how it took place. We find that man, created in the image of his God in knowledge and holiness, was placed in Eden on probation with the alternatives before him, of life on the condition of his perfect obedience, and of death as the penalty of disobedience. We find that man in this probation stood, not for himself only, but for the whole race that should descend from him in the line of natural generation. But man, in the hour of temptation, failed and fell, involving himself and his entire race in the penalty of death. Our world, then, is a fallen world. It is a world of

sin; and in sin it is a world of dead souls. All men are dead in sin. But man does not cease to be, nor can he ever cease to be, for he is a created and immortal person. We must now seek for an explanation of this death which leaves man alive in his physical and intellectual life while dead in sin. It is the death, not of the body nor of the intellect, but of the spirit of man.

We have already found that there are two kinds of life on earth, the physical and the psychical—life in matter and life in mind. Of the first there are two forms, the vegetable and the animal. Now it seems that there are also two forms of psychical life, the intellectual and the spiritual. In physical life the two forms, the vegetable and animal, are analogous in many points, but are so dissimilar in others that it is impossible to regard animal life as only a higher degree of vegetable life. In psychical life both forms, the intellectual and the spiritual, inhere in the same substance—the immortal mind; and yet spiritual death does not carry with it intellectual death. A man may be spiritually dead, and at the same time intellectually alive. Man's mind in its creation is naturally immortal, and neither physical death

on one side, nor spiritual death on the other, can destroy its natural and constitutional immortality, nor the consciousness of its own existence and activities. The physical death of man is not the end of his life, but only an event in his life.

In the divine Word we are taught that all men since Adam's fall are, in their fallen condition, spiritually dead. The penalty for eating the forbidden fruit, as preannounced to man, was, "*In the day* that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Man did eat, and in eating he died, not physically nor intellectually, but spiritually. In Adam's transgression the race sinned and the race died. Accordingly we read, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." This is a dead world—a world of dead souls. This is spiritual death, and it does not involve physical or intellectual death. Physical death was in the world before man sinned, and, so far as the mere animal world is concerned, it is not a part of the penalty of man's sin. If man had not sinned, he might have been exempted from physical death. Who knows? We know, on the testimony of Scripture, that man is spiritu-

ally dead in the midst of his physical and intellectual life—spiritually dead while in the full and conscious exercise of the functions of his body and the faculties of his mind.

What, then, is spiritual life? It must be a form of life higher than the intellectual, and yet, a form of life that inheres in the mind along with the intellectual. It must be a condition of mental life higher than mere intellectuality. It is that condition of mental life which the Scriptures call spiritual-mindedness. That condition consists in the free and harmonious fellowship of the created mind with the eternal Mind. Whatever breaks up the harmonious communion and intercourse between the soul of man and his Creator is the cause of man's spiritual death. Sin does this; and hence sin is the cause of man's spiritual death. Therefore, the removal of man's sin will restore him to spiritual life, that is, to conscious and joyous communion with his God, in whom he lives and moves and has his being.

Can sin be removed from the life of man? It can be removed only in one way—through the redemption of Jesus Christ. The declaration of the fact that Jesus Christ came as the Lamb of

God to take away the sin of the world is the gospel—the good news from heaven to earth—proclaimed in the Bible as its divine revelation. Man's spiritual life is, then, the redemption of his soul from the death of sin, and the bringing of it back into the life of holiness through the atonement of Jesus Christ, the living Saviour of the dead world. This divine plan of man's salvation is unfolded in the Bible, and nowhere else. It is a divine revelation, and not a human philosophy. Our Christianity is not an explanation of the phenomena of nature, but the introduction into our fallen world of a divine Person as the living Saviour of the dead race of men. It is not a system of morals, but the divine provision for the restoration of spiritual life to the dead soul. Faith in Jesus Christ is the condition of attainment unto this life. This faith is the hand of the soul accepting this life as a divine gift. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life; and he that believeth not shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth upon him."

As man is dead in sin, he can find his spiritual life only in the way of redemption from sin.

Redemption means that the price must be paid. "The wages of sin is death." This is the price that must be paid for man's redemption. This price must be paid in man's nature, and on this earth, where man has sinned. If not paid in this life it must be paid in the next life, and *there* the penalty becomes eternal death. In order to redeem a lost possession the price must be paid within the limits of the time and of the conditions of redemption. It was therefore necessary that man's Redeemer should come to the earth and make the atonement in the domain where man had sinned, and where he is yet in a redeemable condition. We cannot conceive of Christ's making the atonement in heaven, because death cannot exist where sin has never entered. Jesus Christ could not have died in heaven. There is no death there. We cannot conceive of Christ's making the atonement in hell for man's sin committed on earth. Hell is the domain of death. In hell all are spiritually dead, and the death is eternal. There can be no life nor resurrection there. If Jesus had died for man in hell, his death would have been eternal. It is the risen Lord, he that was dead but is

alive again forevermore, that redeems. This is the world of probation, where life and death meet in conflict and contend for the victory one over the other. The redeemed are prepared on earth and then translated to heaven, where death can never enter. The unredeemed, when removed from earth, are transported to hell, where life has no admission. Hell is beyond the reach of life. It is the dominion of unredeemable death. Then Christ must come to earth and die for man, where death can be overcome by a resurrection from the dead. But man's Saviour must be born into his life in order to die his death. Hence, the Voice of Mercy that spake to fallen man at the gate of Eden—the eternal Word that was with God in the beginning—the living Logos that is God—became incarnate in the soul and body of man. Thus the Word was made flesh and dwelt among men, the eternal Son of God became the Son of Man on earth, the Lord of heaven became man's brother in human life, in order that he might die man's death, and, rising from the dead, redeem man and restore him to spiritual life. Thus eternal life, the life of redeemed man, is the gift of God through Jesus

Christ our Lord. It is the unmerited gift of infinite love. This gospel is condensed and focalized in the one glorious declaration that shines brighter than the sun, and floods the earth with light and fills it with hope: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

By his death, making atonement for man's sin, Jesus brings life into the dead world. But what was the death of Jesus Christ? Was it physical death or spiritual death? Most surely it was physical death. Men saw him die upon the cross. Men saw his dead body buried in the tomb. But was physical death all of the death he died? He died in his physical death under the sentence of man's law. That was the great crime of the world. Men crucified the Redeemer of men. But the wages of sin is spiritual death. Did Jesus Christ pay for man the wages of sin? That was the price of man's redemption. Spiritual death consists, as we have seen, in being dissevered from and forsaken of God. This death, in the midst of his physical agonies, Christ died for man. In Gethsemane he said, "My soul is exceeding sor-

rowful, even unto death." On the cross he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This is the death which Christ died as man's substitute under the sentence of God's law. As man's Redeemer Jesus Christ took upon himself and endured for man all the agony and ignominy of spiritual death. This is what the Creed means in the mysterious clause "he descended into hell."

Jesus Christ in dying paid, in all respects, the "wages of sin"; and consequently his death has made full atonement for man's sin; and so it brings spiritual life within the reach of every man who will accept it by faith, the condition on which it is offered to the race.

This brings us to the consideration of a most significant point, in which the death of Jesus is differentiated from the death of any other person that ever died; it was the death of the sinless and the innocent, and consequently must have been a vicarious death, the sinless dying for the sinful. The same justice that demands death as the penalty of sin prohibits the death of the sinless. If the death of Jesus Christ was not the vicarious atonement for man's sin, then it was an

unutterable and inconceivable outrage to justice. It is impossible to justify the death of Jesus on any other hypothesis than that it was, as the Scriptures teach, the sinless giving himself unto death for the redemption of the sinful. It was the self-sacrifice of infinite mercy to infinite justice, paying the price of man's redemption from the righteous penalty of justice. Then the death of the Man Christ Jesus was both self-sacrificial and self-worshipful. His death was self-sacrificial. This means immeasurably more than that it was a self-sacrifice in the ordinary sense of the word. It was all this, and immensely more. Men have lived and died in self-sacrifice for a good cause. Patriots have died in self-sacrifice for their country. Martyrs have died in self-sacrifice for their religion. The death of Christ was more than martyrdom. It was a worshipful sacrifice—the only real sacrifice that ever was, or ever can be, in this world. All other sacrifices, Jewish or pagan, were, consciously or unconsciously, typical and prophetic of this, the great sacrifice of the sinless for the sinful.

The sacrifice of the sinless Christ has power to redeem sinful men from the death of sin. It is the

power of God unto salvation to the believer. But in every sacrifice there must be a priest worshiping, a victim which is offered in worship, and God who is worshiped. All these we find in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ on the Roman cross. The Man Christ Jesus, the God-man, is the High-priest of our redemption; the real man in Jesus Christ was the victim that was offered—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; the true God in the Man Christ Jesus is the Divinity to whom the sacrifice was offered in worship. Thus the death of the sinless Christ making atonement for sinful men was the most real and the most sublime act of worship possible or conceivable. It was God worshiping himself in the sacrificial offering of his assumed humanity to his eternal divinity. This was the price of man's redemption, and this price Jesus Christ has paid in his death on the cross. That death was both self-sacrificial and self-worshipful. The cross, then, on which Christ died was an altar of worship. From the human point of view it was the contrivance of execution, an object of torture and shame; but from the divine point of view it was an altar of worship, the object of transcendent glory.

It was necessary that Christ should thus die, in order that his death might make the atonement for the sin of the world. But it was not possible that he should be holden of death. When he died without sin, he paid the penalty of man's sin. By death he conquered death. Death being conquered, he rose to life again. It was not possible that the vanquished enemy should hold him. He paid the wages of sin. Thus he redeemed life from death. His redemption was perfect and complete. He redeemed both soul and body.

He lived while his body was in the grave. He met the pardoned thief in Paradise. He lived in life apart from his body, that men might know that their souls, redeemed, shall live in Paradise while their bodies sleep in their graves. The intermediate life is a conscious life—a life of memory and of knowledge. How could there be a meeting between Jesus and the saved thief without self-conscious life, without the memory of the earth-life, without the knowledge of one another, and without the power of thought and of discourse with one another? His atonement was also redemption from physical death. That man might know this, he rose in physical life out of

the grave on the third day. Man shall rise in physical life, and know this world again.

“He that believeth on him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.” The risen Christ is the living Saviour of this dead world; but faith in him is the condition on which this salvation, spiritual life, is offered to all men. “Whosoever believeth shall be saved.” Man is again put on probation, not this time as a race, but each man for himself. The future and eternal destiny of each is suspended upon the free volition of his own will, receiving or rejecting the salvation now and here offered to him. “Whosoever will may take of the water of life freely.” All are invited, and all may come if they will; and no one that comes is ever rejected.

But this offer, as the whole trend of the Scriptures teaches, is limited to this life. What man does here determines what he shall be hereafter forever. “He that believeth shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned.” This is the short and terrible alternative which the Bible sets before every man of the race to whom its gospel is preached. Between the believers and the unbelieving in the future life there is fixed an im-

passable gulf. The soul goes out from this mortal life to meet its endless and changeless destiny. It is just as reasonable to expect physical life on a post-mortem medication as to hope for spiritual life on a post-mortem probation. The future destiny depends upon the faith that forms the character in this present life.

But in order to avoid a possible misinterpretation, we add that, in the light of reason as illuminated by Scripture, we believe that all dying in a state of infancy are saved in immortal life through the atonement of Jesus Christ our Lord; and by a state of infancy we mean that condition which incapacitates the mind for the conscious and free exercise of the volition of a free and responsible will. This incapacity may arise from the want or defect of mental development, or from the invincible darkness of an external environment. Eternal justice demands that this exception should be imbedded in the provision of infinite mercy that offers immortal life to our race, now spiritually dead, on the condition and with the proviso of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the living Saviour of our dead world.

Life can only originate from life; therefore,

the Saviour of the dead world must be a living Saviour. "He ever liveth; though he was dead he is alive again, and liveth forever and ever." Nothing less than a new life in the soul, produced by the touch of God's living Spirit, is salvation. Therefore, Jesus saith to every man of the race, as he did to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This new birth is the change from spiritual death into spiritual life. It is an effect, and must have an adequate cause; and as the effect is life, the cause must be a living power. Death cannot produce life. The living must spring from the living. All science has now settled down in the conviction that life cannot be a spontaneous generation from the dead. Therefore, spiritual life must spring from an ever living Spirit. Hence, Jesus saith, "Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." This is true science. The law of cause and effect requires the nature of the effect to be contained in the nature of the cause. Figs cannot grow on thistles, nor grapes on thorns. Life

produces life, and like produces like. Spiritual life for dead souls must spring from the Spirit of the living Saviour.

There are three realms of life and experience possible and accessible to man: the animal life, in which he lives and dies in common with the beasts that perish; the intellectual life, in which man is elevated into a whole realm of experiences in which the beasts can have no share with him; and still above this is the realm of spiritual life, with its new experiences, of which unregenerate man can form no proper and adequate comprehension. Discourses concerning Christian experience in the realm of spiritual life must be as unintelligible to the unconverted and unspiritual of earth as discourses concerning colors and shades would be to those who have been blind from birth. "The natural man," saith St. Paul, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." A man may be learned in the lore of men, he may have made deep researches in philosophy and science, he may have traveled far and wide and seen many countries and learned

many languages, he may have extorted by his experimental methods many secrets from nature, he may know of this world and its wisdom a thousand times more than the humble disciple of Jesus who has been born of the Spirit and by spiritual regeneration has entered into the realm of spiritual experience and discernment; but if that humble disciple of Jesus, whether educated or illiterate, be indeed a spiritually-minded man, he has entered into a realm of life as much higher than the highest attainments of the carnally-minded man as vision is above touch, as rational thought is above animal instinct, as spirit is above matter, and as heaven is above earth. He has begun to live the immortal life. This life begins on earth, and never ends; it goes on expanding forever into new and higher developments of spiritual discernment and felicity. This is no flourish of rhetoric, nor dream of the mystic. It is a grand and glorious reality, of which millions to-day have precious and priceless experience. It is the life of the soul which Christ, the living Saviour of the dead world, imparts to all who believe in his name. At times, in the experience of every Christian, the consciousness of

this spiritual life is more vivid than at others; and some Christians attain unto loftier heights in their experiences than others because they have a stronger faith and a deeper spirituality.

More than fourteen centuries ago, on the shores of the Italian sea, the blessedness of this spiritual life and its assurance of immortal bliss were the subject of discourse between a saintly woman who was drawing near the close of her mortal life and a young man who, having passed from spiritual death into spiritual life, had just consecrated himself unreservedly to the ministry of the gospel of him who had just rescued his soul from the death of sin. That young man was the highly gifted and learned St. Augustine, and the woman who conversed with him was his pure-minded and devout-hearted mother, whose prayers for her son were not forgotten in heaven and can never be forgotten on earth. The scene of the memorable conversation has been painted by Ary Scheffer, over the title "St. Augustine and His Mother Monica." This is the passage that inspired the painter: "When," says St. Augustine, "the day drew near on which my mother was to leave this life, it chanced that we

found ourselves alone, she and I, leaning upon the sill of a window which looked upon the garden of the house where we had stopped at the port of Ostia. There, far from the crowd, after the fatigue of a long journey, we were waiting for the moment when we were to set sail. We were alone, conversing with indescribable sweetness concerning Christ and the sweet fellowship of his Spirit with our spirits. Forgetting the past and stretching forward toward the future we asked ourselves, What shall be for the saints in heaven that immortal life 'which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and which hath not entered into the heart of man'? And then, borne aloft on wings of love toward Him who is, we climbed, as it were, up through the celestial regions whence the stars, the moon, and the sun send us their light; and while speaking of our aspirations toward that life that is to come, we touched it for a moment with a bound of the heart, and sighed as we left there captive the first-fruits of the Spirit, and came back again to the sound of the voice, and to the world which begins and ends. Then my mother said to me, 'My son, so far as I am concerned, there is nothing more to

bind me to this life. What shall I do in it? There was one thing for which I desired to live, and that was to see you a Christian before I left this world. My God has granted me that, and more than that. Why should I tarry here any longer?''

Such is the foundation of the Christian's hope, such is the felicity of his experience, and such is his triumph in the face of death. With Christ Jesus as our living Saviour to save our souls from eternal death, why should we fear to die this mortal death? Millions have seen his light, in which the assurance of immortal life shines, and have passed, without fear or faltering, through the dark gateway of mortal death into the shining realm of immortal life, where sin is unknown and sorrow can never cast a shadow. Christians depart this life to be with the Lord forevermore.

THE END.

A SELECTION FROM

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY'S

CATALOGUE

WORKS BY DR. A. J. GORDON.

Dr. Gordon is a writer with whom to differ is better and more suggestive than to agree with some others. He loves the truth, he gives his readers much that is true and deeply of the essence of Christianity.—THE INDEPENDENT.

The Holy Spirit in Missions. 12mo., cloth, gilt top.....\$1.25

A new volume by this author is always welcomed. The theme of this new work, as treated by Dr. Gordon, is sure to be full of deepest interest. " " " " "

Ecce Venit; Behold He Cometh. Paper, *net*, 50c.; cloth.....\$1.25

It is impossible to read this book without being stimulated by it and getting higher and fresher views of some aspects of Christianity which are perhaps dwelt on less than they should be."—*Independent*.

In Christ; or, The Believer's Union With His Lord. *Seventh Edition.* Paper, *net*, 35c.; cloth.....\$1.00

"We do not remember since Thomas a Kempis a book so thoroughly imbued with a great personal love to Christ. It is evidently the happy result of hours of high communion with Him."—*Boston Courier*.

The Ministry of Healing; or, Miracles of Cure in All Ages. *Third Edition.* Paper, *net*, 50c.; cloth \$1.25

"An interesting and thoughtful work. Dr. Gordon marshals together witnesses from all ages and all classes in favor of his belief that cures may still be wrought through prayer."—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

The Two-Fold Life; or, Christ's Work for Us, and Christ's Work in Us. Paper, *net*, 50c.; cloth..\$1.25

"Distinguished by exquisite purity of thought, by deep spiritual insight, and by great strength of practical argument. The work is one of great spiritual beauty and helpfulness."—*Baptist Magazine*.

Grace and Glory; Sermons for the Life That Now Is and That Which Is to Come. Paper, *net*, 50c.; cloth.....\$1.50

"Here we have power without sensationalism; calm thought, living and earnest, expressed in forcible language; the doctrine orthodox, evangelical, practical. We shall be surprised if these discourses are not reprinted by an English house."—*C. H. Spurgeon*.

The First Thing in the World; or, The Primacy of Faith. Vellum paper covers.....\$.20

Cheaper edition, popular vellum series......10
"There was a fear lest the prominence given the exceeding beauty and umbrageousness of "Love" should overshadow the sister grace of "Faith," but Dr. Gordon has rescued us from the danger of forgetting that faith in Christ is the foundation of our Christian life."—*Christian at Work*.

Books of Travel and Research

Ten Years' Digging in Egypt, 1881-1891, by W. M. Flinders Petrie. With a map and 116 illustrations. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.50

"The book has a special interest in the confirmation and the illustration it affords as to the high condition of civilization existing in a land so intimately interwoven with Biblical history. The narrative is pleasantly written, and the illustrations are not only admirably executed, but greatly help us in realizing what they represent."—*N. Y. Observer*.

"Mr. W. M. F. Petrie, the well-known Egyptologist, has prepared a concise popularization of the results of his scholarly labors—its clear and compact pages are those of a trustworthy authority—the story told is really fascinating."—*S. S. Times*.

The Ainu of Japan. The Religion, Superstitions, and General History of the Hairy Aborigines of Japan, by Rev. John Batchelor. With 80 illustrations. 8vo., cloth.....\$1.50

"The author has a subject seldom treated in our literature and he communicates his rather exclusive information in fascinating and instructive fashion. His style is very vivid."—*Golden Rule*.

"The Ainu are the aborigines of Japan, and now number only some sixteen or seventeen thousand. This record of their character and customs is effectively given, and the text is supplemented by numerous engravings,"—*N. W. Christian Advocate*.

A Winter in North China, by Rev. T. M. Morris.

With introduction by Rev. R. Glover, D. D., and a map. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.50

"Contains much matter of general interest, and many pleasant sketches of China and the Chinese. An intelligent, recent and grandly encouraging report."—*The Independent*.

The Story of Uganda, and the Victoria Nyanza Mission. By S. G. Stock. With a map and illustrations. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.25

"The Story of Mackay is given with fulness and power; there are added also the stories of the martyr Bishop Hannington and his fateful journey, and of Bishops Parker and Tucker, of the other mission, together with a sketch of these missions under the brutal King Mwanga since Mackay's untimely death."—*The Golden Rule*.

The Fifth Gospel. The Land where Jesus Lived.

By Rev. J. M. P. Otts, LL. D. With 4 maps. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.25

"Whatever other books one may have read on Palestine, he will find new pleasure and instruction from the perusal of this one."—*Central Presbyterian*.

For list of "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge," see special catalogue.

Complete list of Missionary Books sent free on application.

CHICAGO. Fleming H. Revell Company. NEW YORK.

Books of Illustration.

For Pulpit and Platform; for Preachers and Teachers.

Seed Corn for the Sower; or, Thoughts, Themes and Illustrations, for Pulpit and Platform and for Home Readings, by Rev. C. Perrin, Ph. D. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.50

Although *no less than two hundred authors* have been drawn upon to supply the material for this work, it is believed that the great mass of illustrative matter will be found entirely new and fresh—embracing nearly 400 pages of original and carefully selected illustrative excerpts covering a wide range of subjects.

"To teachers and all engaged in Bible instruction, it will prove a volume of great help and usefulness and furnish ready to their hand many a nail with which to fasten in a sure place the truths they may desire to drive home."—*The Christian at Work.*

Feathers for Arrows; or, Illustrations for Preachers and Teachers, by Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.00

"The work covers a wide range of subjects. The metaphors are always striking and frequently brilliant, while the truths that they illustrate are such as have always formed the staple of Mr. Spurgeon's discourses. A choicer collection of illustrations we do not know."—*The Freeman.*

Spurgeon's Gems. Being Brilliant Passages from his Discourses. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.00

A series of earnest thoughts and graphic pictures, all of them revealing the true greatness of the preacher's conceptions, his individuality and strength. Gems of great brilliancy, which will make a permanent impression upon the mind of the reader.

Gleanings Among the Sheaves, by Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. Cloth, gilt top.....\$.60

"These extracts are quite Spurgeonic—racy, rich and rare, both as to style and matter; full of exquisite consolation, faithful advice, clear analogies, poetic touches, and glorious old gospel. We do not wonder that eight thousand copies were sold on the day of publication and trust that eight times eighty thousand will find their way to the religious public."—*Weekly Review.*

Scripture Itself the Illustrator: A manual of illustrations gathered from scriptural figures, phrases, types, derivations, chronology, texts, etc., by Rev. G. S. Bowes. 12mo., cloth.....\$1.25

Information and Illustrations for Preachers and Teachers. Helps gathered from facts, figures, anecdotes and books, for sermons, lectures and addresses, by Rev. G. S. Bowes. 12mo., cloth..\$1.25

CHICAGO. Fleming H. Revell Company. NEW YORK.

BOOKS FOR YOUNG MEN

Moral Muscle and How to Use It, by Frederick

Atkins. A Brotherly Chat with Young Men...\$.50
"This is positively the best book for young men that we have seen. It looks the facts of young men's lives full in the face, and proclaims the gospel of industry, perseverance, self-control, and manly Christianity. We can certify that no one will find it stupid."—*St. Andrew's Cross*.

First Battles and How to Fight Them, by F. A.

Atkins. Friendly Chats with Young Men...\$.50
"It is true in its substance, attractive in its style, and admirable in its spirit. I heartily commend this little volume."—*Rev. John Hall, D.D.*

The Spiritual Athlete and How He Trains, by W.

A. Bodell. Introduction by Rev. B. Fay Mills...\$.50
A work for young men, pithy, pointed and practical.
"Its power and value lie in the consistent carrying out of the comparison between physical and spiritual training."—*The Independent*.

Brave and True, by J. Thain Davidson. Talks to Young Men.....\$.50

"This is one of the books the wide distribution of which can not be too greatly desired."—*Presbyterian Journal*.

Thoroughness, by Dr. J. Thain Davidson. Talks to Young Men. 12mo., cloth.....\$.50

"Dr. Davidson knows young men and how to talk to them. He is ever racy, fresh and practical and in this, his latest issue, no less so. We warmly commend the book to workers among young men."—*The Christian*.

The Secret of Success; or Finger Posts on the Highway of Life, by John T. Dale. Introduction by Hon. John V. Farwell. 8vo., cloth.....\$1.50

"This volume is a perfect thesaurus of maxims and of inspiring incidents relating to attainment. It is a book of counsels to young men and women who desire to achieve what their generation has a right to expect of them."—*Golden Rule*.

Turn Over a New Leaf, and Other Words to Young People at School, by B. B. Comegys....\$.50

"These talks are on a great many every-day topics of great importance. They are treated so sensibly and so practically and with such a kindly spirit, that it would be well if a copy might be placed in the hands of every one of the young people of the land."—*Herald and Presbyterian*.

The Fall of the Staincliffes. Prize Story on the Evils of Gambling, by A. Colbeck. Paper, 25 cents; cloth......75

"It depicts in a clear, forcible way the terrible evils of intemperance and of gambling in all its forms. It is not a 'goody goody' book but a good book."—*Public Opinion*.

CHOICE GIFT BOOKS

The Earthly Footprints of Our Risen Lord, Illumined. A continuous narrative of the Four Gospels according to The Revised Version, with introduction by Rev. John Hall, D. D. Illustrated by 113 full-page half-tone re-productions. Small 4to, cloth, *net*.....\$1.50
Gilt edge, with silk book mark, boxed, *net*... 2.00
Full morocco, flexible, gilt edges, round corners, boxed, *net*..... 3.75

Pictures reflecting the best in sacred art from Raphael to the present day are scattered profusely through the book.

"To many the life of the Christ will be a new book in this form. The very fact that this is not our usual method of reading the Word will give it a new reality."—*Golden Rule*.

A Gift of Love, and Loving Greetings for 365 Days, by Rose Porter. Long 18mo. Parti-cloth.....\$1.00
White cloth, silver top, in box..... 1.25
Decorated silk, silver top, in box..... 1.75

"'A Gift of Love' is the work of a loving heart. It contains a text of Scripture for every day of the year with the addition of an appropriate thought in poetry or prose all bearing on the theme of love. To use it day by day for a year thoughtfully and prayerfully, must result in a rich growth in love on the part of the user."—*N. Y. Observer*.

Prayers from the Poets, by Martha Harger. 16mo., two colored cloth, gilt top.....\$1.00
Leatherette, boxed..... 1.50

"This volume is admirable. The prayers are better suited to some of our moods than formal Litanies, and are selected from excellent sources. The book will be a dear treasure to many hearts."—*The Churchman*.

Poems by Frances Ridley Havergal. Author's edition complete. The only unabridged authorized edition published in America. 12mo., 880 pages, cloth.....\$2.00
Beveled boards, full gilt..... 2.50
Half white vellum, gilt top, uncut edges..... 2.50

Nineteen Beautiful Years, By Frances E. Willard, or, Sketches of a Girl's Life, with preface by John G. Whittier. New and revised edition, 12mo., cloth.....\$.75

"A very sweet and tender record of an exceptionally beautiful life."—*John G. Whittier*.

"The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life" may be had in several presentation styles. Send for list.


CHICAGO Fleming H. Revell Company. NEW YORK.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: August 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 244 813 0

